



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2020

No. 30

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As Members prepare to return to their home districts, endow them with ears to hear the voices of their constituents, those who voted for them and those who did not. It is the strength of our representative democracy that all have a voice in the governing of the Nation.

Our Nation will soon be remembering Presidents Washington and Lincoln, giants of American history. One presided over a nation united in its inception behind their President, the other over a nation divided soon after his election.

May each of their examples be inspiration to all Americans that faithfulness to the Constitution and all the laws of our land and the hope of our Founders is the responsibility of us all to bring to our political discourse.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WALORSKI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, President Trump stood in this very Chamber last week promising that he would protect Medicare and Social Security, but like so many things with this administration, that empty promise didn't even last a week. In fact, when he sent his budget proposal to Congress on Monday, it cut more than \$1.6 trillion for Medicare, Medicaid, and other healthcare programs. It cut another \$24 billion from Social Security.

As the top 1 percent of wealthy corporations continue to benefit from the President's tax cut, he is now asking for you, the American people, to pay for it.

He likes to brag that the stock market is up and unemployment is down, but what he refuses to acknowledge is that the economy isn't working for most working folks.

Healthcare costs are rising as his administration sues to eliminate the ACA in its entirety. The cost of living is increasing as he tries to cut funding for affordable housing. And prescription drug prices continue to climb despite our passage of H.R. 3, which is collecting dust on MITCH MCCONNELL'S desk.

The President's budget is nothing more than assault on hardworking families just trying to keep a roof over

their heads and put food on their table. The American people deserve better.

House Democrats are going to continue passing legislation that actually gets government working for the people again, and the President and MITCH MCCONNELL should get off the sidelines and join us in this effort.

ABORTED FETAL REMAINS BURIAL

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2,411 unborn children whose remains were finally laid to rest with dignity yesterday in South Bend, Indiana.

These victims of Indiana's most prolific abortionist would be in their late teens now, graduating from high school and entering into college, but their innocent lives were cut short, and they were denied a proper burial. Instead, their remains sat for almost 2 years in a garage, a car trunk, in moldy boxes and Styrofoam coolers.

Such callous disregard for human life should shake us to the core. These children deserve justice and dignity.

To ensure this never happens again, the House must pass the Dignity for Aborted Children Act to build on Indiana's law, upheld by the Supreme Court, that requires dignified treatment of aborted fetal remains.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in observing a moment of silence for the thousands of innocent victims who were laid to rest yesterday.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE TO HOLD GUN TRAFFICKERS LIABLE

(Mr. CASTEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, 1 year ago Saturday, five people lost their lives and many more were

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1127

injured when a gunman entered an Aurora, Illinois, warehouse and started shooting.

At the vigil for those victims, I made it clear that, if we want to stop people from getting shot, we have to politicize this and we have to take legislative action.

Now, Illinois has some of the strongest gun laws in the country, but our neighbors don't. In Chicago, 60 percent of the guns recovered from crime scenes were trafficked in from out of State. And, worse, we have never had the courage to regulate guns the same way we regulate cars. If my daughter took my car out and crashed into my neighbor's garage, I would be liable. That is common sense.

That is why, yesterday, I introduced the Gun Trafficker Detention Act. This bill requires gun owners to report if their gun is lost or stolen within 48 hours and imposes criminal penalties if they fail to do so and their gun turns up at a crime scene. It would also allow the victims of gun violence to hold traffickers legally liable for death or injury caused by their guns, regardless of who pulled the trigger.

Are there people who won't like this bill? Yes—gun traffickers. Every other American will be safer, and I encourage my colleagues to join me and support this bill.

HELPING TO REFORM OUR BLOATED FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, advancing the cause of our constitutional Republic by adopting policies that restore the confidence of the public in the U.S. Congress is one of the goals I have had since my election last November.

The current lack of confidence is largely due to the dysfunction, partisanship, and distrust that is so prevalent. That is why I am proud to work together with my colleagues who are on the Republican Study Committee government reform task force and who are committed to helping reform our bloating Federal Government in order to expand opportunities for all Americans.

Congress was established through Article I of the U.S. Constitution, and, as such, our Founding Fathers put the utmost responsibility in lawmakers to uphold their inalienable rights and to maintain proper transparency while doing so.

Sadly, today's Congress has strayed far from that through Federal overreach. This makes the task force even more timely and important.

The three main focuses of this task force are reforming government power structures, practices, and personnel policies. Each of these categories has a considerable amount of reform that would be meaningful and effective if enacted.

I am committed to ensuring the beliefs of our Founding Fathers live on today through Congress' actions by reforming government so that it truly serves the people for whom it was created and by whom it is empowered.

PFAS WATER CONTAMINATION

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, PFAS water contamination continues to threaten the purity of our drinking water and the health of our communities, including my own.

PFAS contaminants exist on more than 400 military bases nationwide and threaten the health and safety of those who live nearby. This public health crisis demands our full attention and requires a national solution.

This 116th Congress has proposed and passed more PFAS legislation than any previous Congress in history, including the PFAS Action Act, which would require the EPA to enforce cleanup of contaminated sites and require a nationwide PFAS drinking water standard.

Still much work remains to be done. We must stand up for stronger regulations, cleaner water, and healthier communities.

Clean drinking water cannot be another issue that the Senate majority continues to ignore and add to their graveyard. We have an obligation to address this national health crisis.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Senate, including my own Senators, to prioritize the well-being of our communities and to act swiftly on the passage of the PFAS Action Act.

BRINGING JUSTICE TO MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE AMERICAN WOMEN

(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, in advance of the fifth annual Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women's Memorial March that is taking place in my hometown of Duluth, Minnesota, tomorrow, I rise to bring attention to the violence facing our Native American communities.

Everyone has a right to live safely in their communities, but the murder rate of Native American women is currently 10 times the national average. More than half of Native American women have been sexually assaulted, and thousands of Native American women and girls have gone missing.

This national crisis has been ignored for far too long, and it is time that Congress acts. That is why I cosponsored Savanna's Act, legislation that would better prepare Tribal law enforcement to respond to these crimes. I believe that this should be one of the

easiest bills that we pass this year and call for its quick passage.

Madam Speaker, I will be proud to march with our Native American communities this Friday and honor those we have lost. I believe that, together, we can bring justice to the missing and murdered indigenous Native American women and hold the individuals who commit these acts of violence accountable.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S 2021 BUDGET

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the irresponsible and immoral budget request proposed by President Trump.

The President's shameful betrayal of Americans most in need of vital services comes just days after he stood in this very Chamber and promised he would protect them.

A budget reveals our priorities, and this document makes clear President Trump does not prioritize hardworking Americans and their families. Once again, the President goes out of his way to target Americans' access to healthcare and affordable education.

In the President's upside-down budget, \$500 billion is stripped from Medicare, \$900 billion from Medicaid. Student loan funding is cut by \$170 billion. Public Service Loan Forgiveness would be completely eliminated. More than \$200 billion would be cut from the SNAP program, the safety net for families facing temporary challenges putting food on the table.

Madam Speaker, these cuts are wrong, and the House must not let them go forward. I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress to protect these critical programs that our seniors, working families, young people, and children depend on.

RECOGNIZING ARIZONA'S BIRTHDAY AND 108TH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my home State of Arizona's birthday and our 108th anniversary of statehood.

Since February 14, 1912, the great State of Arizona has welcomed those who wish to experience a life of prosperity, opportunity, growth, and a culture second to none.

Every year people from all the over the world come to Arizona to experience our State's treasured beauty, and, of course, the five C's.

I know I speak for all of us who live in Arizona when I say we are incredibly grateful to call the Grand Canyon State our home. Our State motto means "God Enriches." Arizona is proof of that.

RECOGNIZING TRIBAL LEADERS

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tribal leaders from around the country gathered in Washington, D.C., for the National Congress of American Indians' 2020 Winter Executive Session.

NCAI was founded in 1944 with the mission to protect and enhance the sovereign rights of Tribal nations and to secure a prosperous future for Native communities.

In fact, initially, NCAI had to fight against many restrictions and injustices perpetrated by this very body. It is this complicated and challenging history that is the backdrop of the work we do here today.

It is important, then, that the United States Government works to honor Tribal sovereignty, promote self-determination, and fulfill the trust responsibility to Native Tribes.

We must also pass advanced appropriations for the Indian Health Service and provide resources to upgrade the roads, schools, and internet access across Indian Country.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to take up these issues immediately and do our part to support our Tribal partners.

□ 0915

HONORING JOE BONAMASSA

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Joe Bonamassa. He is one of the most gifted, talented, and accomplished singers, songwriters, and guitarists in modern-day blues music.

Joe works incredibly hard to give back. Joe has founded the Keeping the Blues Alive Foundation. This foundation fuels a passion for music by funding projects and scholarships to allow students and teachers the resources and tools that they need to further music education.

Joe also gives back in other ways. He is an aficionado of guitars and has a vast collection that he uses to extend music history. And he allows people to come and visit his collection of guitars and amplifiers in a place he calls Nerdville, California.

Joe has done an incredible amount for music, for music history, and to advance the cause of music having an impact in an increasing number of people's lives.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring Joe Bonamassa for his contributions to the world of music.

REMOVING DEADLINE FOR RATIFICATION OF EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 844, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the joint resolution, is adopted and the joint resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H.J. RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any time limit contained in House Joint Resolution 208, 92d Congress, as agreed to in the Senate on March 22, 1972, the article of amendment proposed to the States in that joint resolution shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the United States Constitution whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 79.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is long-overdue legislation to ensure that the equal rights amendment can finally become the 28th amendment to the United States Constitution.

This year, we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of women gaining the right to vote. Despite the century that has elapsed, our Constitution still does not recognize or guarantee full equal protection of the law for women and gender minorities, but H.J. Res. 79 would bring us one step closer.

The resolution removes the previous deadline Congress set for ratifying the ERA and will, therefore, ensure that recent ratifications by Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia are given full effect.

The ERA offers a basic and fundamental guarantee: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

That is it. Very simple.

In the years since it was passed by overwhelming bipartisan majorities in the House and the Senate, we have made great strides to secure that equality, including through existing case law decided under the 14th Amendment.

The ERA would enshrine those principles and take the final critical step of ensuring that laws disadvantaging women and gender minorities are subject to the most rigorous form of constitutional scrutiny.

In recent years, we have seen a series of breakthroughs for women's rights and gender equality. We have seen millions of women march in support of their rights and dignity as equal citizens. Through the #MeToo movement, we have had long-overdue and sometimes painful conversations about the violence and harassment that women and gender minorities experience, whether in the workplace, at home, or in schools and universities.

We have seen women get elected to Congress in record numbers. And just weeks ago, Virginia became the necessary 38th and the last necessary State to ratify the equal rights amendment. We are on the brink of making history, and no deadline should stand in the way.

The Constitution itself places no deadlines on the process for ratifying constitutional amendments, making it doubtful whether Congress had the authority to impose such a deadline in the first place. But if it had such authority, then Congress clearly also has the authority to remove any deadline that it previously chose to set.

I want to thank Representative JACKIE SPEIER for introducing this resolution, which takes that important step. This resolution will ensure, at long last, the equal rights amendment, having been proposed by Congress years ago, having now been ratified by three-quarters of the States, can take its rightful place as part of our Nation's Constitution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, three-quarters of the States failed to ratify the equal rights amendment by the 1979 deadline set by Congress, yet House Democrats are trying to retroactively revive the failed constitutional amendment.

Congress does not have the power to do that. Congress set the deadline; it was passed; it did not get approved; and now there is an end run to go around that.

The United States Supreme Court recognized this in 1982 when it stated that the issue was moot because the deadline for ERA ratification expired before the requisite number of States approved it.

The next year, the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives,

acting on the same understanding, started the entire process of ERA approval over again. But that new ERA also failed to achieve the required two-thirds majority in the House on November 15, 1983.

But today, in defiance of historical reality and the clear acceptance of the situation by all relevant participants in the original debate, the Democrats have brought forward a resolution that denies the obvious. Now, the proponents of this resolution want to convince their base that if both Houses of Congress pass this joint resolution, and it is signed into law, the 1972 ERA will become part of the Constitution just because the Democrats control the Virginia State legislature and that legislature passed the ERA this year.

Even current Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg—and she is taking a lot of heat for this—a supporter of ERA since its beginning, has said, just a few months ago:

I hope someday we will start all over again on the ERA, collecting the necessary States to ratify it.

On Monday of this week, Justice Ginsburg said of the ERA:

I would like to see a new beginning. I would like to see it start over. There is too much controversy about latecomers—Virginia, long after the deadline passed. Plus a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said: We have changed our minds.

Congress does not have the constitutional authority to retroactively revive the failed constitutional amendment and to subject the citizens of all 50 States to what may be the current political trends in just one State.

The U.S. Supreme Court has already recognized that. Past Democratic leaderships of the House have recognized that. Justice Ginsburg has recognized that. But apparently, the current Democratic leadership is intent on re-writing history.

As we have our debate today, I will show, and our speakers will show, what the real intent about this is, and it has nothing to do with equal rights. It has a lot to do with other issues that will be exposed today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the chief sponsor of this bill.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

This is very simple, Members. Women want to be equal, and we want it in the Constitution.

I am equal on this House floor with all of my male colleagues, but when I walk out, I have fewer rights and protections than them.

I rise today because the women of America are done being second-class citizens. We are done being paid less for our work, done being violated with impunity, done being discriminated

against for our pregnancies, done being discriminated against simply because we are women.

The ERA is about equality. The ERA is about sisterhood, motherhood, survival, dignity, and respect.

The world recognizes this. Of the 193 countries in the United Nations, 165 have put this kind of language in their constitutions, but not the United States of America.

From the Women's March to the #MeToo movement to the pink wave, the outrage we have seen among women is because we have been disrespected, devalued, and diminished in our society. And we are fed up.

It is no wonder recent votes to ratify the ERA came in 2017, 2018, and 2020, because we want the ERA now. We have waited for almost a century for the ERA.

I want to thank my Republican cosponsors of this resolution, including Congressmen Reed, Fitzpatrick, and Van Drew.

I know most of you recognize that this is the right thing to do for your wives, daughters, and granddaughters. Ninety-four percent of Americans already support the ERA. In fact, they are surprised it is not already in the Constitution.

Now, some of you will say just re-start the process, but you are the same people who admit you won't vote for it. Some will say, "Well, women already have equality," while they vote against VAWA reauthorization, vote against paycheck fairness, chip away at title IX.

For too long, women have relied on the patchwork quilt of laws and precedents. We have put our lives on the line. We have been forced to take our cases all the way to the Supreme Court, and often, there, we lose.

For my colleagues who think we already have women's equality, talk to Christy Brzonkala, who was raped by two football players at Virginia Tech. She sought justice under the Violence Against Women Act, but the Supreme Court struck down the civil suit provisions, claiming Congress lacked the authority to pass it.

Talk to Lilly Ledbetter, who had to rely on an anonymous note to learn she was paid less than her male colleagues at Goodyear.

Talk to Betty Duke, who was passed over for promotions and paid \$10,000 less for her work at Walmart.

Talk to Peggy Young, who was placed on unpaid leave, losing her health insurance, while pregnant, at UPS, all the while men were granted the exact same accommodation that she was denied.

The ERA is about building the America we want. It is about forming a more perfect Union because, simply put, there can be no expiration date on equality.

I urge my colleagues to affirm their support for women's equality and vote for this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I am a woman, so I obviously care and support equal rights for women. But I oppose this bill for three reasons.

First, the bill is not constitutional. When the ERA originally passed Congress, it explicitly set a deadline for ratification. The deadline was in 1979, almost 41 years ago. Only 35 States of the 38 needed had ratified it. Then five States unratified it. So the count is down to 30. Thus, the equal rights amendment was dead.

The U.S. Department of Justice issued a legal opinion just last month, reiterating that the ERA's ratification timeline is expired.

Supreme Court Justice Ruth Ginsburg said:

The deadline passed. I would like to see a new beginning. I would like it to start over.

Secondly, the ERA is not necessary. Women's equality of rights under the law is already recognized in our Constitution in the Fifth and 14th Amendments. The ACLU's women's rights director wrote: "It has been clearly understood that the 14th Amendment prohibits discrimination based on sex." Plus, many Federal, State, and local laws already prohibit sex discrimination.

The third reason I oppose this bill: If ratified, the ERA would be used by pro-abortion groups to undo pro-life legislation and lead to more abortions and taxpayer funding of abortions.

But don't take my word for it. Let's look at what pro-abortion groups have done and what they say.

In 1998, the New Mexico Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the State's ERA required the State to fund abortions. NARAL Pro-Choice America, which supports abortions, asserted that the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion and would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws.

In a 2019 letter to the House Judiciary Committee, the ACLU stated: The equal rights amendment could provide an additional layer of protection against restrictions on abortion.

In conclusion, this bill is unconstitutional. The ERA is unnecessary, since constitutional Federal, State, and local laws already guarantee equal protections. And the ERA, if ratified, would be used by pro-abortion groups to undo pro-life laws.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, again, the deadline was not part of the amendment. It was a resolution by Congress. And if Congress can set a deadline, it can remove a deadline.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 0930

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank Representative SPEIER, Representative MALONEY, and all of those who have been such warriors on this issue for such a long period of time. They are keeping the faith.

This constitutional amendment was passed in 1972, to be specific, in the early part of 1972. I was a member of the Maryland State Senate in 1972, and I had the honor in the late spring of 1972, just months after the ERA had been passed, of voting to ratify that.

Now, the previous speaker said in only 35 States. That is 70 percent of the States ratified that in a timely fashion. Timely in the sense that we set in a resolution, as the chairman pointed out, a date. Seventy percent of the States of this Nation.

Now, it needed three more States. It has now received three more States. I have been an advocate for the equal rights amendment for essentially 4 decades, actually longer. I will be proud to vote for it today.

Just a few months, as I said, after Congress adopted the ERA, Maryland voted for ratification. I thought that it was long overdue even then in 1972. Here we are some 48 years later, and it still is.

Our Founders declared “all men are created equal” in their Declaration of Independence. Surely, no Founder, if they were writing that document today, would have said “men” meant white, property-owning men. Surely, they would not have written that. Surely, none of us would have supported that.

Since the very beginning Americans have been taking steps, therefore, to define that in a more expansive, inclusive term representing our universal values. We amended the Constitution to ensure African Americans and women could not be denied the right to vote. It took a long time. Particularly, I hope the women in this body will think of the suffragettes who were extraordinarily active and involved in our community and making decisions in our families and in our communities and country but who could not vote prior to 1919.

From 1789 to 1919 women could not vote. I am the father of three daughters, the grandfather of two granddaughters, and the great-grandfather of three great-granddaughters. For me to go home to them tonight and say I voted against your being equal in America. Now, my wife passed away, but if I went home to her tonight and said I voted against your being equal in America or those grandchildren and great-grandchildren who happen to have been born as women and say to them I voted against your being equal in America today.

We passed the Civil Rights Act to make clear that all must be treated equal regardless of race. We passed the ADA, which I cosponsored 30 years ago to ban discrimination against those with disabilities. But still nowhere in our Constitution does it state clearly that women must be treated equally

and that one must not be subject to discrimination because of their gender.

The ERA would enshrine that basic tenant of our democracy in our Constitution at long last. Seventy percent of the States and then three more said that ought to be in our Constitution. Three-quarters of the States have voted to ratify this amendment.

Discrimination against women has through our history kept bright and talented Americans from achieving their full potential in our economy. Because of their hard work, the sacrifices, the leadership, and the perseverance of trailblazing women, we have seen barriers come down, doors of opportunity open, and glass ceilings shatter.

Discrimination, inequality, and injustice persist, and we will hear arguments on this floor rationalizing why discrimination ought to still exist. And as long as our Constitution does not explicitly ban discrimination based upon gender as it does based on race, we will continue to see forms of legal discrimination against women linger in our country.

Taking this step to add the equal rights amendment to the Constitution is one of the many that House Democrats are taking to combat discrimination against women simply because they are women.

Last year, we passed the Paycheck Fairness Act. Not everybody voted for that, but, in my opinion, everybody voted for that who thought equal pay should mean equal pay, irrespective of gender and based upon work performed. That built on the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 to ensure equal pay for equal work.

We also passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Most of us on our side voted for that, but there was a rationalization why some thought, no, we will not protect women against violence.

We have continued working to protect women's rights to make their own healthcare choices and to access quality affordable care.

Who said that was part of the Constitution?

The Supreme Court of the United States. They said that was a constitutional right and we see effort after effort to erode that constitutional right.

I am proud that the Democratic Caucus in the 116th Congress is not only the most diverse in American history, but also includes the greatest number of women.

In Virginia, it was an election that saw the house of delegates reach 30 percent women and the State senate reach 28 percent. Once it got there, the women of Virginia stood up and said this ought to be in the Constitution of the United States, and they voted to do so. Virginia now has a woman speaker of the house, as we do in our U.S. House, and as my home State of Maryland has in our house of delegates. It is because more women are stepping up to run for office and winning elections that more women's voices are being heard in our democracy.

That is why this resolution is on the floor. That is a wonderful thing, and I have been proud to help recruit talented women to run for the House as Democrats. And very frankly, we need more women as Republicans, a diminishing group, I might add.

I urge my colleagues, men and women, Democrats and Republicans, to join in supporting this resolution.

And, finally, is it too late?

It is too late. But it is never too late to do the right thing.

Make this part of our Constitution. Stand up and say, yes, women should be included as all humankind who are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights. That is the principle that we are articulating today.

Alice Paul, who first wrote the ERA and campaigned for it for most of her life was once asked why she kept all her focus on getting the job done, and she said this, “When you put your hand to the plow, you can't put it down until you get to the end of the row.” We are not at the end of the row, but this is a way upon that row to make it complete to make our Constitution protect all people, male or female, Black or white, all people.

At long last, let's hold firm to that plow. Let's get the job done. Vote “yes” on this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to commend the women who have gone before us to celebrate the achievements that women have made and to reaffirm the fact that we are equal in the eyes of God and in law.

Women make up 51 percent of the population, comprise over half of the college students, make up most of today's medical and law school students and own the majority of new businesses.

Women are not victims in need of validation. Little girls can be whatever they want to be, whether that be an astronaut, a doctor, a full-time mom working at home, or a member of Congress.

In addition, Federal law and court precedent uphold our rights. That is something to applaud, and I do. However, today's legislation is problematic on several fronts.

First, the resolution is unconstitutional. The time limit to pass the ERA expired decades ago. Congress can't go back and remove a deadline from a previous constitutional amendment initiative. The Supreme Court has recognized that the 1972 ERA expired, and the Department of Justice issued a ruling saying Congress may not revive a proposed amendment after a deadline for its ratification has expired. Pretending that we can remove the time limits for passage is both futile and deceptive.

Secondly, if the time limit could be extended, the ERA would not bring

women any more rights than they currently have right now, but it would entrench the legality of abortion. We know this from court precedent by listening to those who have the most to gain from constitutionally protecting abortion on demand.

In 1998, the New Mexico Supreme Court ruled that the equal rights amendment in their State constitution requires State funding of abortions. Federal courts are likely to do the same. Perhaps that is why every pro-abortion organization is endorsing passage of the ERA.

NARAL Pro-Choice America says, "With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion."

The National Organization for Women says, "An ERA—properly interpreted—could negate the hundreds of laws that have passed restricting access to abortion. . . ."

But that is not the only concern with passing this resolution. Besides being unconstitutional and shredding State and Federal pro-life protections, the ERA would also erase decades of progress which have provided opportunities for women, advance women's progress through Federal programs, and secure necessary protections for women and girls.

How? By incorporating gender identity in the definition of sex, jeopardizing private spaces for women, girls' sports programs, and women's educational institutions.

The ERA endangers laws, programs, and funding designed to benefit women providing a pathway for legal challenges to welfare programs, grants for battered women's shelters, efforts to bolster women participating in STEM programs, as well as State laws governing child support, alimony, and custody. These outcomes are anything but pro women.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 79, which takes a key step to ensure that the equal rights amendment will become part of our Constitution.

Nearly 100 years after women gained the right to vote, it is difficult to believe we still haven't given women equal rights. It is hard to believe it is a serious disagreement in this Chamber.

In the year 2020, it is unacceptable that women still make only 80 cents for every dollar earned by men and that women are still subject to violence, harassment and attacks on their freedom to control their own bodies.

In Judiciary Committee this morning, a brilliant female law clerk is describing sexual harassment by a distinguished and respected ninth circuit judge. This should never happen. And with ongoing efforts to undermine

progress we have made; the equal rights amendment is more important than ever.

It took over 130 years to give women the right to vote. It is almost 100 years since they have gotten it. It is time to give women their proper place in the Constitution of the United States, which most modern constitutions have, equality regardless of sex.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 79.

Of course, I believe in equal rights. Women should never face discrimination and harassment. I believe we should be empowering women and girls to achieve their dreams.

So it is disappointing today to stand in this Chamber and see this important issue turned into some type of political stunt. The deadline for States to ratify the ERA passed nearly 4 decades ago. Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has stated the only path forward is to start over.

Let's be honest, this is not about equality or women's rights. This is about enshrining unrestricted abortion in the Constitution and allowing full taxpayer funding for abortion. Now is not the time to be weakening pro-life protections.

Yesterday, in South Bend, Indiana, in my district, the remains of 2,411 victims of abortion were finally given a dignified burial after spending 20 years in moldy Styrofoam boxes in the back of the doctor/abortionist's car and in his basement.

□ 0945

These unborn boys and girls would be young men and women today entering college.

Moments ago, we stood on this House floor together and we offered a moment of silence that these innocent lives were taken and there were victims, over 2,400.

Madam Speaker, I would ask that, together, we stand again to defend the rights of the most vulnerable among us, that we stand together today for the sanctity of life, to lift women up, to protect women, and to strengthen families.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this misguided resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, with Virginia becoming the 38th State to ratify the equal rights amendment, today we make it clear that Congress never intended the arbitrary deadline to act as a barrier to ratification of this vital amendment.

Ratification of the equal rights amendment affirms our Nation's values by codifying an expressed prohibition

against sex discrimination in our Nation's foundational document.

While our Nation's courts have properly recognized that women are entitled to equal protection under the law, we have a responsibility to do all that we can to guarantee that, regardless of sex, all Americans are treated the same in every aspect of their lives, including making a living, obtaining healthcare, and accessing public services.

These rights must not be swayed by political ideology or depend on judicial philosophy. Equality is a founding value of this great country and, more than any other word, describes the very idea of America.

Madam Speaker, a vote for H.J. Res. 79 is a vote for equality. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 79.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Listening to people on the other side say that there is a cornucopia of benefits awaiting women should the ERA become a part of the Constitution, I am here to ask Members on both sides of the aisle to look past what looks nice on a bumper sticker or a 40-second sound bite to realize that there are going to be many consequences that will hurt women should this be ratified. I will just talk about insurance, because insurance is regulated by the States.

Girls get substantially lower rates on auto insurance because they are better drivers. With the ERA and the State regulation, that would become unconstitutional, and girls are going to have to pay boy drivers' rates for auto insurance, which really does not reflect the actuarial exposure of that at all.

Secondly, look at life insurance. Women live longer than men and, as a result, in life insurance, also regulated by the States, you see women's rates being lower than men's rates becoming unconstitutional, and women are going to be paying more to life insurance companies for the coverage that they decide on.

I could go on and on and on. We had a lot of hearings on this in 1973.

I am here to say that, when the ERA was originally passed in 1972, women's rights were not enshrined in a lot of State laws. There has been tremendous progress in this area both at the Federal level and in the States. The proponents of this resolution completely ignore that happening. We don't.

We think that the statutory protections that have been passed all around the country in the last almost 50 years have advanced women and have addressed a lot of the complaints that we hear from that side of the aisle.

This is going to unleash a Pandora's box of lots of litigation that has been raised by this, some of which has been brought up by my colleagues on this side.

Let's not enrich the lawyers. Let's do the right thing. Don't pass this resolution. Enforce the laws that have been passed both here and in the State capitols.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank all of the women of America. I thank the sponsor of this bill. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member for being on the floor. I thank him.

I ask the question: Does anybody see the sense of women not being in the most powerful document of laws and power of the American people?

Let us be reminded of the words of Abigail Adams: "I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And, by the way, in the new code of laws"—which she is saying to her husband—"which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands."

I rise enthusiastically to support H.J. Res. 79 and to say to my colleagues there is no constitutional prohibition for passing this.

We are grandly involved because this is the 1972 passage by the State of Texas of the equal rights amendment. And here, in 1977, Betty Friedan and Bella Abzug were in Houston at the 1977 National Women's Conference that our predecessor, Barbara Jordan, was at.

Let us pass H.J. Res. 79, because, as Abigail Adams said, let's remember the ladies.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.J. Res. 79, which eliminates the ratification deadline for the Equal Rights Amendment and will lead to the long overdue adding of the ERA as the 28th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I am reminded of the imperative powerfully expressed on March 31, 1776 in Braintree, Massachusetts in a letter from Abigail Adams, the future First Lady, to her husband John Adams:

I long to hear that you have declared an independency—and by the way in the new Code of Laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make I desire you would Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the Husbands.

The resolution before us will help enshrine for all time the belief, promise, and commitment that all men, and women, are created equal and endowed with by the Creator with the same inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We are making real this promise thanks to the bipartisan resolution introduced by Congresswoman Spiers of California.

The Constitution does not prohibit the action we are taking; in fact, it permits it since ratifi-

cation deadlines are not even mentioned, much less imposed by the Constitution. This resolution reinforces that, the previous deadline is no bar to passing the ERA.

Under Article V of the Constitution, the Equal Rights Amendment "shall be valid to all intents and purposes whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states."

A resolution identical to H.J. Res. 79 has been introduced in the United States Senate, which I call upon the Senate to take up and pass forthwith.

Madam Speaker, it is useful to review how we arrived at this moment in history.

Beginning in the late 1960s, the National Organization for Women (NOW) devised and began implementing a strategy of pushing for equal rights through a combination of impact litigation and advocacy for the Equal Rights Amendment.

I remember this particularly well because in November 1977, the first National Women's Conference was held in Houston, Texas and attended my congressional predecessor, the Honorable Barbara Jordan.

The National Women's Conference was inspired by a 1975 United Nations-sponsored event from two years prior which led President Gerald Ford to establish a national commission to investigate women's issues.

Congress later voted to provide \$5 million to fund the organization of regional conferences and to hold a national gathering at the conclusion, the result of these efforts was the National Women's Conference meant to unite all women and give them an opportunity to voice their hopes for the future of the government.

I remember that Phyllis Schlafly of the conservative Eagle Forum organized and came to Houston to lead backlash demonstration protesting the ERA and the women's movement, claiming that the ERA would force women to give up their right to be supported by their husbands, and subject them to the military draft and deployment to Vietnam.

That was the launch of the conservative counter-offensive to derail ratification of the ERA and the beginning of the schism that has seen equality between the sexes and expanding the economic, privacy, and political rights of women subject to increasing partisan debate and action that is continues to the present day.

In 1970, Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan filed a discharge petition in the House to bring the ERA to the floor, after the Judiciary Committee consistently refused to act on it.

The discharge petition was adopted, and the ERA passed the House by a wide margin.

The Senate Judiciary Committee also held several days of hearings in 1970 on its version of the ERA but it failed to gain enough votes that year.

On October 12, 1971, the House voted by 354–24 to approve a version of the ERA that stated:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each house concurring therein), that the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of its submission by the Congress:

Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

On March 22, 1972, the Senate passed the ERA by a vote of 84–8.

The following month, Madam Speaker, I graduated from college in the first undergraduate class of women to attend Yale University in September 1969.

I was a member of the group of 250 upper-class women who transferred to Yale University, a number that eventually led to 1,500 women being admitted over the years, in addition to the 4,000 male students.

Between September 12–14, 1969 undergraduate women students arrived on campus and at that time, 48 of 817 FAS faculty were women and only two had tenure.

I am proud to be a part of the history of Yale University and had the opportunity to speak about my experience at the 50th Anniversary last year.

The presence of women at Yale, which had been an all-male institution was a sign of the change that was sweeping the nation.

I first arrived at Yale with the anticipation and anxiety of any college student arriving on campus for the first time.

This was an extraordinary milestone—both for Yale and for us young women.

But being a "first" is not all that people may assume that it is.

In the centennial year of the 19th Amendment, on January 15, 2020, the Virginia General Assembly became the 38th state to vote to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, the magic number needed to become enshrined in the Constitution.

Because of the ERA, women are finally included in our Constitution, making them equal to men under law.

A vote to eliminate the ratification deadline for the ERA is a vote for equality; a vote against the measure is a vote to preserve the legacy of sex discrimination.

Women will not continue to be second-class citizens in their own country.

The absence of the ERA has meant that women can be paid less for their work, violated with impunity, and discriminated against simply for being women.

Women made up more than 6 in 10 seniors who lived in poverty last year, with the poverty rate for senior women at 11 percent.

The average Social Security benefit for women 65 and older is about \$14,270 per year, compared to about \$18,375 for men 65 and older.

In the 116th Congress, women hold just 23.6 percent of seats in the U.S. Congress.

In 2019, just 33 Fortune 500 CEOs are women, a new record.

While women-owned businesses account for 42 percent of all firms, women-owned business account for just 8 percent of the total private sector workforce and 4.3 percent of total revenue.

Some legal scholars note the location of the deadline in the preamble is important, because the ERA's deadline was not part of the text that the states voted on when they ratified the amendment.

Other scholars argue that the deadline itself is unconstitutional because Article V of the

Constitution does not include mention of deadlines.

A close reading and clear understanding of the Constitution leads inescapably to the conclusion that when the Framers considered a time period to be of the essence, they specified the time period clearly in the document itself.

Moreover, in *Coleman v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433 (1939), the Supreme Court rejected the idea that Article V contains an implied limitation period for ratifications.

Madam Speaker, as a country founded on principles of liberty, justice and equality, and a global leader in formulating international human rights standards, the United States need to pass the ERA to meet basic standards for women who are denied equal access to legal rights and protections.

Too many women in the United States inexplicably lag behind international human rights standards and it is a myth that women in the United States already enjoy all of the expected standards of rights and protections afforded under America.

The reality is, women in the United States experience continued discrimination and daunting disparities that prevent them from fully participating as equal members of society.

For example, women have risen to some of the highest levels of legislative and executive representation over the years, yet with 20% of Congressional Members and an average of 24.9% of state legislatures, but the United States ranks #72 in the global market of women represented in public and political positions.

While the number of women justices has significantly increased, women litigants' access to justice is severely limited.

Although women vote in higher percentages than men, women's access to voting is under attack in many states where increased voter ID requirements and voter purges pose unprecedented barriers.

Although women constitute nearly half of the US labor force, at a participation rate of 57%, equal economic opportunity is severely lacking given deficient or nonexistent mandatory standards for workplace accommodations for pregnant women, post-natal mothers and persons with care responsibilities.

What also remains a shameful truth in America, is the gender wage gap which has remained at or near 21% over the past decade.

And women with higher levels of education experience the largest earning gaps, as do minority women regardless of educational attainment.

The percentage of women in poverty has increased over the past decade, from 12.1% to 14.5%, with a higher rate of poverty than men and women are exposed to higher rates of homelessness and violence without adequate protections in place in shelters and housing support options.

Women in detention facilities throughout the country also experience increasingly high rates of over-incarceration, sexual violence, shackling while pregnant, solitary confinement, lack of alternative custodial sentencing for women with dependent children, and insufficient access to health care and re-entry programs.

Migrant women traveling to the U.S., many victims of trafficking and violence, including

sexual violence, are kept in detention centers with children for prolonged periods of time.

The U.N. has reported that women, particularly black and LGBTQ women, in the U.S. experience police brutality and increased incidents of homicide by police.

Even though women own over one-third of commercial businesses in the United States, primarily in small and medium sized businesses, these businesses face greater barriers in obtaining low cost capital from sources such as the SBA—which awards less than 5% of federal contracts to women-owned business.

Finally, one of the most alarming deficiencies for women in America is the inability to access basic health care and the imposition of devastating barriers to reproductive health and rights.

Too many women are suffering dire and deadly consequences.

Between 1990 and 2013, the maternal mortality rate for women in the U.S. has increased by 136%.

Black women are nearly 4 times more likely to die in childbirth, and states with high poverty rates have a 77% higher maternal mortality rate.

The United States deserves to much better.

It is unacceptable that women in America are facing a health care crisis so dire that the global community is denouncing it as a human rights violation.

Sadly, the direction States are taking will only further dismantle women's access to affordable and trustworthy reproductive healthcare.

While clinics are shutting down at drastic rates throughout the country, devastating restrictions and barriers imposed throughout Texas strike at the core of this abomination.

A Texas statute known as HB2 (House Bill 2), was enacted several years ago under false claims to promote women's health, when in fact it only set in motion dangerous restrictions on women's access to reproductive health care.

In addition to constant attacks on funding for reproductive health care clinics, abortion providers in Texas were forced to undergo impossible million-dollar renovations and upgrades.

Denying hundreds of thousands of women health care services in Texas, nearly half of all reproductive health care clinics were forced to shut down, and now only 10 remain in the second largest state in the country.

No woman in America should be denied the dignity of being able to make choices about her body and healthcare.

Access to safe, legal and unhindered healthcare must be realized by all women.

These simple facts can no longer be denied, and hypocrisy can no longer be tolerated.

A woman's personal autonomy over her own body and her right to choose whether to bear or beget a child is a constitutionally protected fundamental right.

More than 40 years ago in the landmark decision in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, (1973), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 7-2 that the right to privacy under the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment extends to a woman's decision to have an abortion.

We cannot ignore the obvious hypocrisy of imbalanced protection and access to fundamentally protected rights for women in America when it is easier to purchase and lawfully possess a firearm—even for a person on the terrorist watchlist—than it is for a

woman to exercise her constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy.

Madam Speaker, this is not fair, and it is not right.

And with the ERA added to the Constitution, it will also not be lawful.

Madam Speaker, Congress had the authority to extend the deadline and it chose to do in 1979; a fortiori, it has the power to eliminate the deadline today.

And that is the right, just, and moral thing to do.

I urge all Members to stand on the right side of history and join me in voting to pass H.J. Res. 79 so that the Equal Rights Amendment can take its rightful place as the 28th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, we have heard my Democratic colleagues say that passing the equal rights amendment is necessary to secure basic rights under the law for women. Not only is this untrue, it obscures a fundamental fact. This ERA actually denies the most basic human right: the right to life. This ERA uses gender equality as a smokescreen to create an unlimited constitutional right to abortion.

Instead of working to craft legislation that protects women's rights without trampling on the right to life, Democrats have put forward, today, an unconstitutional, partisan measure.

Not only would this result in on-demand abortions across all 50 States, but it would also clear the way to provide taxpayer-funded abortions throughout all 9 months of pregnancy, costing millions of dollars every year.

This measure is not about advancing women's rights, especially as women across the country, Republicans and Democrats alike, are increasingly horrified by the practice of late-term abortion and by recent comments made in New York and Virginia that lifesaving treatment should be denied to some newborns.

Allowing women to discard their unborn children at taxpayer expense is not ensuring gender equality. It is not protecting women. It is not empowering women. It is not providing women equal pay for equal work. It is simply another step down the path of devaluing all human life and dignity.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

In Texas, many years ago, I marched in support of the equal rights amendment. Today, I join my colleagues to reaffirm that support.

Women are behind some of this Nation's greatest achievements. We fought for civil rights, set athletic records, sent men to space, and then went there ourselves. We have forged

our paths in history, yet we are still not equal to men under the eyes of the law.

We must remove this stain from our Constitution. Today, we are voting to remove an arbitrary deadline so we can finally prohibit gender discrimination under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I will proudly vote in favor of the resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

As many in my district would say, "It is time to approve the ERA." "Ya es hora de aprobar el ERA."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.J. Res. 79.

It pains me to say that life is under attack in our Nation. The pro-abortion discussions taking place around this country are sickening. In the last year, we heard a Governor promote infanticide, and we saw State legislatures take action for the same.

We still haven't had a vote on this floor in the United States House of Representatives to protect babies who survive abortion. Yesterday, in committee, I even introduced legislation that would protect babies who survive abortion. It failed along party lines once again.

We have millions of American families who would love to adopt, yet we don't discuss that. I know women who have cried every month when they realized that they had not conceived the baby they so desperately wanted. I know men and women who have undergone multiple tests and procedures just to conceive a child. They would gladly adopt a baby that someone else didn't want.

Instead, today, we are voting once more on another piece of legislation that would drastically reduce protections for life. This bill would create the basis for taxpayer-funded abortion at the Federal level, and it would permanently allow abortion until birth for any reason throughout the Nation. It would force government-funded healthcare providers and hospitals to provide abortions.

We cannot have that. We cannot bring abortion into a healthcare debate because it is not healthcare. Abortion is murder.

If we want to discuss protecting rights for all Americans, it needs to pertain to everyone, including and, especially, newborns.

While I always welcome a conversation with my colleagues about how we can advance women's rights and the rights of all people, this is not the way to do it. It is not through thinly veiled messaging bills with nice names but radical policies.

We can pass good pro-woman, pro-family, pro-American legislation through bipartisan solutions.

So if we are going to do it, let's do it; but today, sadly, we won't, and that is so disappointing.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

I rise today in strong support of the equal rights amendment and the resolution before us.

Today, this body comes together unabashed in our conviction for a future that expands the vision set forth by our Founders. Together, we strive for a nation that advances the notion of equality, that takes up the mantle of the unfinished work that is the American Dream and the practice of government by and for the people—for all the people.

My daughter, Natalie, is just over a year-and-a-half old, and I look forward to telling her one day about today, how the people's House, led by the Chamber's first female Speaker, voted to ensure that the women of her generation will be the first to grow up knowing that the Constitution truly guarantees equal rights.

It feels fitting to close by quoting Shirley Chisolm, the first Black female Member elected to this body and the youngest, until my good friend LAUREN UNDERWOOD took office last year, who said, when Congress sent the ERA to the States for ratification: "The time is clearly now to put this House on record for the fullest expression of that equality of opportunity which our Founding Fathers professed. . . . It is not too late to complete the work they left undone."

I support the resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 79.

As a woman who has worked all her life, often in male-dominated professions, I detest discrimination in any form against any group, and I have always done all that I can to eliminate it. Furthermore, I welcome any discussion on how to root out discrimination against women where it exists.

But do not be deceived. This is not what this legislation is about.

The 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution already provides women and all Americans equal protection under the law, but the goal of this legislation is different. The goal here is to expand access to abortion up to birth and to overturn the broadly supported policies that protect taxpayers from being forced to pay for abortions.

□ 1000

As we know all too well, *Roe v. Wade* has broadly legalized abortion in the United States, but the equal rights amendment that this resolution tries to ratify goes much further.

There is a broad consensus that the ERA could be used to overturn pro-life

laws, legalize abortion up to birth, and mandate taxpayer-funded abortions.

The expansion of abortion is not the only harmful impact of the ERA. It would have a harmful impact on shelters that protect women from violence, eliminate women-specific workplace protections, and destroy women's sports.

Furthermore, were this resolution ever to become law, the Supreme Court would undoubtedly rule that it does not ratify the equal rights amendment.

As everyone in this room knows, when Congress initially passed the equal rights amendment, it intentionally included a 7-year deadline for the required 38 States to ratify, a deadline which has long since passed. Multiple States have also rescinded their ratification.

As such, Supreme Court precedent requires that any attempt to ratify the ERA must start at the beginning. Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was recently quoted saying she would like the process to start over.

To be perfectly clear, with this resolution, the Democrats are attempting to write into the Constitution the right to an abortion at all three trimesters, force taxpayers to pay for them, and eliminate all conscience protections for medical providers who wish to abstain from abortion.

This resolution is not about protecting women. It is a partisan messaging bill designed to appease radical pro-abortion groups. If the majority were serious about the equal rights amendment, it would start the process anew and give all States the option to consider the ERA again.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I would remind everyone that the equal rights amendment simply says: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied on account of sex.

If people on the other side want to admit that equality of rights under the law means there must be a constitutional right to abortion, well, that is wonderful. Of course, the constitutional right to abortion is already established under current law.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, what a glorious day this is.

Today, the House of Representatives will vote to remove the arbitrary deadline to ratify the equal rights amendment. With our vote today, and with Virginia's historic vote to become the 38th and final State necessary to ratify the amendment, little girls, their moms, and women across this great Nation will know that, yes, our Constitution can, will, and must enshrine a ban on discrimination on the basis of sex.

Equality of sexes is not debatable. It has no expiration date.

First proposed almost a century ago and passed by Congress in 1972, the equal rights amendment would be a momentous step forward for women to

end unequal pay, pregnancy discrimination, and sexual harassment and exploitation.

So today, to women across this country who are watching, as the first South Asian woman ever elected to the House of Representatives, let me say: We see you. We stand with you. And we will fight for you.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, women have been fighting tooth and nail for decades to be recognized as equal under the eyes of the law. While we made significant gains, it is time for a full constitutional equality.

In 1866, Frances Ellen Watkins Harper, a free-born Black woman, addressed the National Women's Rights Convention in New York City, and she said: "Justice is not fulfilled so long as woman is unequal before the law. We are all bound up together in one great bundle of humanity. . . . Society cannot afford to neglect the enlightenment of any class of its members."

These words still hold true today for our mothers, for our daughters, and for our future leaders. We must take up the mantle of the women who came before us and pass this amendment for a more just future.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased that the gentlewoman from Virginia is in the Chair and grateful to her for her leadership and our other colleagues, ELAINE LURIA and ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, as new Members of Congress who give us the opportunity as the majority to bring this important legislation to the floor. I thank them for Virginia's leadership in all of this. It is so appropriate that the Congresswoman is in the Chair for this because she was a leader in the State legislature on the equal rights amendment when she served there.

This is a historic day, a happy day, as the House takes action to move our Nation closer to our founding ideal that all are created equal. I salute Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for her leadership on this resolution and for her lifetime of work to advance equality in America.

The gentlewoman quoted the late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, and I think it bears repetition. Justice Scalia said: "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't."

It does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex. The lack of an ERA

has allowed the Supreme Court Justice to have this interpretation.

Here it is, we say it over and over again: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." How can you have a problem with that?

Let me also salute Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY, our longtime lead sponsor of the equal rights amendment in the House, for her great leadership, and Chairman NADLER, the members of the Judiciary Committee, and all the Members who came to Congress committed to finishing this fight for the equal rights amendment.

I also want to acknowledge that yesterday, at our press presentation on this, in the audience was a Republican from Illinois who was responsible for Illinois passing the equal rights amendment, Steven Andersson. He was with us at the Capitol. We commend him for being a leader on the ERA, passing it through the Illinois statehouse.

What an honor and how clear that this is not partisan, perhaps only in the House of Representatives, but not in the rest of the country.

Let us acknowledge the millions of women in Nevada, Illinois, Virginia, and across America who have raised a drumbeat for ratification and reignited a nationwide movement for equality.

Nearly 100 years ago, Alice Paul, a Republican, introduced the equal rights amendment, the first proposed amendment to the Constitution calling for women's equality in America.

Fifty years ago, soon after becoming the first African American woman to serve in the Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm stood on this House floor to urge passage of the ERA, calling it "one of the most clear-cut opportunities we are likely to have to declare our faith in the principles that shaped our Constitution."

But today, in this year that marks the centennial of women having the right to vote, it is a shameful reality that the equal rights amendment still has not been enshrined in the Constitution. As a result, millions of American women still face inequality under the law and injustice in their careers and lives.

Without full equality under the Constitution, women face a devastating wage gap, and this has an impact not only on what families earn today but on women's pensions and retirement in the future. This is wrong.

Women face discrimination as they raise families. Sixty-two percent of pregnant women and new moms are in the workforce, but current law allows pregnant workers to be placed on unpaid leave or forced out of their jobs. And sexual harassment and assault too often go unchecked, all leading to women's underrepresentation at the decisionmaking table.

We know what the statistics are—what was it?—33 CEOs of the Fortune 500 companies are women. Really?

Today, by passing this resolution, the House is paving the way to enshrin-

ing the equal rights amendment in the Constitution. It will achieve justice for women and achieve progress for families and for our children, lowering wage disparity and increasing paychecks so moms can pay for their family's needs, such as rent, groceries, childcare, and healthcare.

We are able to strengthen America. It is not just about women. It is about America.

The ERA will strengthen America, unleashing the full power of women in our economy and upholding the value of equality in our democracy.

I have four daughters, one son, two granddaughters, and I can't even imagine how anyone could think of his or her daughter not having equality; his or her sister, mom, wife, not having equality. What is that about, that women should not have the same status of equality as men?

This has nothing to do with the abortion issue. That is an excuse. That is not a reason. It has everything to do with a respect for women: your daughter, your sister, your wife, your mother. And you are saying, by voting against this, that your daughter, your sister, your mother, your spouse should not have equal protection under the law in the Constitution of the United States.

To those who say that the ERA is not necessary, let me quote from a recent statement from the American Association of University Women. It states that many "Americans mistakenly believe that the U.S. Constitution explicitly guarantees equality between men and women." Perhaps you think that. "The equal rights amendment would, once and for all, guarantee constitutional equality between men and women. Its ratification would provide the constitutional guarantee that all men and women are truly equal under the law."

I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this resolution. It will be bipartisan in the United States Senate when we send it over there shortly, to ensure that women are truly equal under the law in America. Because we know in America, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for bringing this resolution to a vote and thank Representative SPEIER and Representative MALONEY for their work on this legislation.

This is a historic day. It has been nearly a century since the first constitutional amendment to guarantee

equal treatment for women was introduced in 1923. Since then, 37 States have ratified the equal rights amendment, including my home State of Pennsylvania in 1972.

Virginia's ratification of the ERA this past January brought us one step closer to this basic right that we will be held equal in the eyes of the Constitution. The motto of Susan B. Anthony's newspaper was: "Men their rights and nothing more; women their rights and nothing less." Today, we again say women will accept nothing less than equality.

ERA builds on the work of Anthony and others like Jeannette Rankin, Alice Paul, Ida B. Wells, and this diverse Congress.

I am filled with joy today because I am looking forward to going home and telling my granddaughters, Aubrey and Ella, that we are one step closer to a more perfect Union.

□ 1015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER and JACKIE SPEIER for their historic leadership on the equal rights amendment.

Madam Speaker, first introduced in 1923, the equal rights amendment is still as relevant and necessary as ever because we know that equality for women will always elude us when it isn't etched into our Constitution.

We have seen it when the Supreme Court gutted the Violence Against Women Act; we have seen it when judges don't enforce equal pay for equal work or when a Federal judge ruled that Congress didn't have the authority to outlaw female genital mutilation. But if your rights are in the Constitution, then they can't be rolled back by the changing whims of legislators, judges, or Presidents.

Women are long past due equal treatment under the law, and we will persist until it is firmly guaranteed. There is no deadline for equality. We demand our equality be spelled out in the Constitution, and we spell it E-R-A.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important vote for equality.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 79, which removes the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment. A woman's rights must be guaranteed by our government.

This bill is about the Members of Congress ensuring that the rights and equality for women are a part of our Constitution.

It is sad to watch those who lose their way because they will find any way to distract from the issue of equality. The Members on the other side are trying to interject abortion into this, but I want to say that even though we have come so far as women—there are a record number of women lawmakers here in this House—we have so far to go, and this corrects that injustice and recognizes equality for women under the law.

As the great Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman in Congress, stated: "The time is clearly now to put this House on record for the fullest expression of that equality of opportunity which our Founding Fathers professed. They professed it, but they did not assure it to their daughters, as they tried to do for their sons."

The time is clearly now to put this House on record for the fullest expression of that equality of opportunity which our Founding Fathers possessed. They possessed it, but they did not assure it. We try as they tried to do for their sons.

Madam Speaker, I encourage support of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Congresswoman SPEIER for introducing this important resolution.

In 1923 Alice Paul introduced the equal rights amendment to include women in our Nation's founding documents. Nearly 100 years later, during my time in the Virginia State Senate, I sponsored the resolution for Virginia to ratify the ERA. But it wouldn't be until January 27, 2020, with the historic number of women lawmakers serving in the State legislature that the great Commonwealth of Virginia became the 38th and final State to ratify the equal rights amendment.

This was not simply a symbolic vote. Specifically affirming equality on the basis of sex in the Constitution will strengthen State and Federal laws that protect women. We need the equal rights amendment to ensure that equal justice under law is a constitutional right for women and not just an inscription over the entrance to the Supreme Court.

Finally, these words will ring true: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

Today, I am proud to cast my vote in support of the ERA and in recognition of the tireless work of so many trailblazers and activists over the years, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 79, a bipartisan bill that moves us closer to adopting the equal rights amendment.

Madam Speaker, American women are barrier breakers. We have broken down barriers and shattered glass ceilings in education, at work, in the law, in the military, and at home. We are in a new era where women are leading in ways that they never have before, but legal gender discrimination, pay disparities, and inequality remain. They will not go away on their own. That is why we need to ensure that women's rights are guaranteed by adopting the equal rights amendment.

I was so proud in 2018 when Illinois ratified the equal rights amendment at long last. Two years later, I am here on the House floor because the women of northern Illinois sent me here to fight for them. I am here to fight for our right as women to equal treatment under the Constitution of our great country.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to move us one giant step closer to legal equality by supporting this essential bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to remove the arbitrary deadline to ratify the equal rights amendment. This year is the centennial of the 19th Amendment, yet women are still fighting for full and equal rights under the law.

Women continue to face many barriers to true equality, including pregnancy and gender discrimination, unequal pay, and a lack of access to a full range of reproductive healthcare services. The equal rights amendment to the Constitution would provide for fundamental equality for women regardless of who is President, who is on the Supreme Court, or changes in Federal law.

Congress first approved the equal rights amendment in 1972, and my home State of Oregon was quick to ratify it the following year. Now, 38 States—the required three-fourths under the Constitution—have ratified the amendment. Today Congress will stand with our States and make it clear that it is time—actually way past time—to adopt the equal rights amendment. It is not too late to do the right thing. It is not too late for equality.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Virginia (Mr. BEYER), who is from the 38th State.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, it has been 97 years since the equal rights amendment was introduced in the 68th Congress and 48 years since the ERA passed the House and Senate.

In those 48 years, I have had three daughters and one granddaughter. Those four young women are brilliant, precocious, and accomplished, with strong character, great morality, and true nobility. These women are every bit the equal of any man I have ever met, yet our Constitution does not recognize their equality nor prohibit discrimination against them.

I am very proud that the Commonwealth of Virginia was the 38th State to ratify the ERA. We must permanently remove the deadline for State ratification and provide an essential legal remedy against gender discrimination.

Does this sound like a political stunt: "Women shall have equal rights in the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

No. These words belong in the United States Constitution. There is nothing partisan about recognizing men and women have equal rights under the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, every single constitution in the whole world written since 1959, including Afghanistan, for example, has the equivalent of the equal rights amendment, but the United States of America does not.

Though my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and President Trump's Department of Justice may tell you otherwise, we need the equal rights amendment, and we need it now.

The requisite number of States have now voted to ratify the equal rights amendment. Last year my home State of Illinois was the 37th State to ratify, and this year Virginia brought us to that number of 38.

Today I will proudly vote "yes" to show my grandchildren—my granddaughters and my grandsons—that women are not only strong, powerful, and resilient, but also equal citizens under the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with us.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 79 and stand shoulder to shoulder with women to demand gender equality and justice.

When I think about the future of our country and what I want it to look like for young women and girls like my granddaughter, Anna, I envision a just and equitable society with fair play, diverse leadership, and equal access to basic healthcare rights. That is why the equal rights amendment is necessary.

For too long our country's structural barriers have cast a shadow over women's rights. With 38 States having affirmed their support for the ERA, we are one step closer to shattering those barriers.

This resolution negates misguided arguments that because it is an arbitrary deadline, the equal rights amendment is effectively dead. It is clear from the recent actions of Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia, and our collective voices, it is still very much alive, and we will not rest until it is ingrained in the most sacred document of our Nation's history.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with our country's women and support our right to constitutional equality.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, 244 years ago women were left out of our Constitution by the men who drafted it. But since then, generations of women and men have blazed a steady trail towards equality in this country; but we still do not have constitutional equality.

I attended many ERA events representing the League of Women Voters in the 1970s, and if someone would have told me then that we would still be fighting for this in 2020, I would have said that it was a failure of justice.

Why is anyone against rights for everyone?

Madam Speaker, equal rights for women transcend your politics, they transcend your age, where you are from, and your gender.

Women in this country continue to receive unequal pay, suffer from harassment in the workplace, endure discrimination for pregnancies, and fight long legal battles over domestic violence cases. A correction of our Constitution is clearly long overdue.

Liberty and justice for all must apply equally to women and men in this country. Let's pass this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished

gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, 28 days ago on Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, Virginia became the 38th State to ratify the ERA. After decades of struggle, 48 years after congressional passage, two-thirds of the States agreed to an amendment that secures equal rights for all American citizens regardless of sex. This amendment would touch every corner of our lives.

With 24 words our Nation will finally fully recognize women as equal participants in society.

To my colleagues opposing the ERA: What are you afraid of?

How can you oppose this resolution and then look women in your district, in your churches, and in your own homes in the eye?

Today is your chance to stand on the right side of her story. I implore my colleagues, vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 79. Let us finish this struggle and at long last have women and men finally equal under the law with their rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution.

□ 1030

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, since women gained the right to vote 100 years ago, we have made incredible progress—rolling back laws like those that kept us from serving on juries, owning land, or even getting our own credit card—and this Congress has more women than ever.

But true equality is still a goal, not a reality. The fact is women are still paid less than men for the same work, and we still have men passing laws that dictate our choices about our bodies.

It is clear, if we want equality, we need the ERA, and the people agree. We saw that at women's marches across the country and in the groundswell of the #MeToo movement.

That energy is leading to change. The people are speaking. It is up to us to listen. Arbitrary deadlines are no reason to silence our voices.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and give women the same rights as men.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support today of Congresswoman SPEIER's bill, H.J. Res. 79. I thank Congresswoman SPEIER and Congresswoman MALONEY for their consistent leadership as warrior women.

The ERA would guarantee rights to all and would finally affirm women's equality in our Constitution by removing this arbitrary deadline.

We know that, too often, women have been relegated to the sidelines and left

out of the Constitution, especially Black women and women of color. For example, there is still rampant gender wage discrimination.

Discrimination against women must end. That is why the ERA is so important. It would make sure that our government would ensure that women are treated equally, a right that needs to be clearly outlined in every aspect of our country.

I want my granddaughters, Jordan, Simone, and Giselle, to know that they are equal to men, that their rights are enshrined in the Constitution. They, like every girl and woman, deserve equality in their country. They should know that their country, the United States of America, has finally joined the rest of the world to stand up for their rights as American women.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this resolution to advance the cause of full and equal rights for all women. I do so for my 1-year-old granddaughter for whom I deeply hope that, when she reaches the age of understanding, the ERA will be as enshrined in our Constitution as is the right to vote today. I also do so as a proud citizen of my Hawaii.

On March 22, 1972, when the U.S. Senate sent the ERA to the States, it was early in the morning in Hawaii; but by shortly after noon that same day, our legislature voted for ratification, the first State to do so.

For my country and Hawaii and for all of our women leaders who led this fight, past and present, I proudly join my colleagues in voting for the ERA.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, after nearly a century, the equal rights amendment is on the cusp of ratification.

At America's founding, women were intentionally left out of the Constitution. As second-class citizens, we lacked the right to vote, hold most jobs, or even own property. Today, we still receive less pay for the same work, and we face violence and harassment just for being women. But the ERA will prohibit all of that. In the eyes of our most sacred document, we will finally be equal.

Women's rights should not depend on congressional whims or who occupies the White House. These basic fundamental rights must be guaranteed.

But, if we want to hand a more perfect union to our daughters—and I have two of them—we must seize this moment to end sex discrimination. We owe it to the women who sacrificed before us and all of our daughters and sons who deserve a life of true equality.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution to remove the arbitrary and outdated deadline for ratifying the ERA.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER). The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, it is my intention to raise a point of order that this resolution requires a two-thirds vote. I will argue the point of order when it is made, but I need to know when the proper time is to raise the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proper time would be when the Chair puts the question on passage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, do I put the question before or after it is passed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the time the Chair puts the question on passage.

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it has been interesting, the discussion on the floor today. It has been interesting on both sides to hear the different aspects of why this bill is on the floor, why we are doing it, why we shouldn't be doing it, and many things. It has been interesting, the discussion, if you go from a strictly number-of-States category.

What has been interesting is my colleagues across the aisle have talked about that there are now 38 States, but they fail to mention 5 States that rescinded their votes. Five States would put you under 38.

What was interesting to me in the Rules Committee the other night, the argument was that, if they rescind it, it is not valid to rescind, yet you can add States after the time limit is up. That is an interesting argument to make if you are actually looking at it from the perspective of if they rescind it within the timeframe yet passed it after the timeframe, that that is okay.

Then I heard one of my colleagues actually mentioned the fact that, if we passed it in here today, that this would now become part of the process, along with the State of Virginia ratifying it, it is now part of our Constitution.

I am sure this was just a euphoric discussion about how this would actually go about, but they were also forgetting the Senate is involved in this. It is amazing.

I was really worried at one point in the discussion that it was said on multiple occasions that there was no protection in the Constitution for women. I was almost scared for a moment that

the 14th Amendment had been repealed and I didn't know it.

It is in there and still is in there. I checked just a few minutes ago. It is safe.

It is interesting to determine, when Ruth Bader Ginsburg, one of the foremost architects in looking at this bill even in the 1970s, coming forward, has said: If you want to do this, start over. Do it the proper way.

As my chairman has said earlier, basically, a deadline should not get in the way of what we want. A deadline should not get in the way of what I want to have happen. That is becoming more and more of a concern in this body, that the rules and parliamentary procedures don't matter if it interferes with what we want.

But, at the end of the day, the question really becomes: Why are we doing this? Why are we bringing this forth when there is absolutely no legal precedent, no constitutional precedent, no anything out there—including some of the founders who actually started this whole process 40-plus years ago, who said this is not the way you do it.

The reason I know that that is a concern is because some of those who have actually said this have been criticized in the media from the perspective of supporters of the ERA to say Ruth Bader Ginsburg's comments have now killed the ERA, or effectively done it. The reason is because she is speaking the truth about this issue.

We disagree on most everything from a legal perspective, but on this one, we happen to agree, and she has laid forth clearly what should happen here.

But let me also say—and it has been talked about a great deal, so I think we just need to come to the real scenario why this is happening. It is not that we believe it will actually happen. For anybody here who believes that today is actually going to put it in part of the Constitution, that is not going to happen.

So what is it? It is a political nod to the understanding of those who are speaking for this.

As we have heard earlier, NARAL Pro-Choice America:

With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion by clarifying that the sexes have equal rights, which would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws.

Also, NARAL:

The ERA will support protecting women's right to abortion. With five anti-choice Justices on the Supreme Court and *Roe v. Wade* on the chopping block, it is more important than ever we codify women's bodily autonomy in our lives.

Codirector of Reproaction:

Abortion restrictions amount to sex discrimination because they single out people for unfair treatment on the basis of sex.

The senior counsel of National Women's Law Center:

The ERA would help create a basis for challenging abortion restrictions.

This is what this is actually about. This is what the basis has needed because there has been a shifting in this

country to understand that, in our opinion—in the opinion of many—abortion is simply murder in the womb. It is not about life.

It is interesting, we are talking about the rights of women today—which, again, this bill doesn't have anything to do with—but we are not concerned if the young women in the womb are even able to have a birthday. That is not a concern.

So what would happen from these folks who are supporting your resolution today? Why do they want it? Because it gives a claim, from start to finish, unfettered abortion.

So what does that mean? That means let's bring back partial-birth abortion, which, if I have to remind anybody here, means the delivery of the child all the way until the moment the chin comes almost out, and then actually crushing their skull. That is what that is.

If that is a right we are protecting, I don't want any part of it, and neither do most Americans. They don't want a part of it. But that is one of those restrictions that will be laid back.

It would also continue to allow unlimited abortions in any State for any reason, including sex selection.

It is interesting that we would talk about this today, the ERA, and use this, yet a family could choose to abort a child because it is a male or a female. Let's be honest about this.

But the bottom line for me, what really bothers me the most about when it is unlimited, unfettered access to abortion that this bill opens up, if it were to have passed, is one that hits close to home for me.

You see, a European country recently stated that a geneticist in Iceland said: We have almost basically eradicated Down syndrome people.

I thought to myself, for a second: That would be great. I mean, if we could actually remove Down syndrome and help those and cure that, that would be an amazing medical discovery for all people. Except there is one portion.

Do you know how they have done it? Through genetic testing and killing the children in the womb. They don't even let them have a birthday.

One Icelandic counselor counsels mothers as follows:

This is your life. You have the right to choose how your life will look. She said: We don't look at abortion as murder. We look at it as a thing that we ended.

Do you want to know why this has opened up, America? This is why.

And for those of us like myself who have a disabled child, I do not want to hear that we are protecting disabled rights and other rights when we are not even allowing them to be born in certain arenas.

Every day, I get a text on this phone. It is from my daughter. Jordan is 27 years old. She has spina bifida. She cannot walk and has never taken a step, and I believe it probably, given

the medical condition, will not happen this side of Heaven. But she rolls and she smiles. She goes to work 3 days a week. She gets herself up early to put her clothes on and take her shower and get a bus that she calls, and she goes to work.

The folks in Sweden, do you know what they want to do? Kill her. Because she is not as valuable, as a Down syndrome child is not as valuable.

Do you want to open this Pandora's box of no abortion restrictions? Then own what you are doing.

But when Jordan texts me, she texts me: Good morning, Daddy. I love you. How was your day?

Madam Speaker, when we found out 27 years ago—a week ago, 27 years ago—that Jordan was going to have spina bifida, we were a young couple just happy that God gave us a child, and to find out that she had a disability only kept our hearts more in tune to what God had given.

My wife went to school the next week, and she was telling the teacher about what was going on. She said: We are trying to figure out where we need to go to have Jordan, help when she is born and get some more medical attention.

This person looked at her and said: You know you have choices, correct?"

And my wife said: Well, yes. There is Northside Hospital and others.

She said: No. Oh, no, dear. You don't have to go through with this. That is your choice.

□ 1045

In other words, as my wife looked at her and said: "You're talking about my baby."

You see, when we go down this path, don't flower this bill up. Look at the ones who actually talk about it and say this is an open door to abortion on demand, with no restrictions, no government interference—in fact, government pays for it.

But before you do that, America, as we look around, I want you to think of the picture on the new Gerber baby ad of the young person with Down syndrome, who is now the face of Gerber baby food. If he was in Iceland, he would have been one of those that, as it said: Oh, we ended.

Think about my daughter, who, when we allow it out there for people who are struggling—and to get news that you have a child with a disability, that is one of the most amazingly devastating things that you can hear because you don't know what the future holds.

But what you do know is life is a gift from God, and that it is my joy to take care of her. We had 30 major surgeries before she was 5 years old, three of which were 9 hours in length. Tell me her life doesn't matter.

For someone who doesn't have the possibility of understanding, and they are given a choice because they have a disability, and somebody tells them and gets to them and says: Don't

worry. Disabilities are bad. Just go ahead and end that life, and go on with your life.

This is what this opens up.

So don't give me a bill that is going nowhere for the reasons that have been given. The true reasons are found in your own supporters. The true reasons are found in what we know to be true.

When you understand what this is about, then I will stand till I have no more breath in my body for the rights of those who can't speak for themselves.

It is amazing to me that it was said: What would I be saying to my daughter if I voted against this?

I would be saying to Jordan, as I will: Jordan, the 14th Amendment is still there. Protections in law are still there. And by the way, restrictions on abortion will not be done away with, and your life matters.

So if you want a picture of this, picture Jordan.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, if Congress can enact a resolution putting a time limit, it can enact a resolution removing a time limit. And when the Senate passes this resolution, the ERA will be part of the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAI B).

Ms. TLAI B. Madam Speaker, I rise very proudly, the first Muslim woman ever elected in the Congress, in support of H.J. Res. 79.

Madam Speaker, what is even more interesting is what I have been hearing about this obsession to control and oppress women in the United States of America. I cannot believe it is 2020, and we are still debating the merits of the equal rights amendment. It is beyond time.

I want you all to know this is about women of color, women with disabilities, transgender women, immigrant women. These women are affected by issues like unequal pay, sexual violence, lack of access for healthcare, and poverty.

So much of what we are doing here, in trying to promote women's equality, is about gender, racial, and economic justice.

Madam Speaker, know this: A "no" vote today is condoning oppression of women in the United States of America. I urge support.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of equality and the principle that our Constitution was designed, not to shore up the dominance of the historically powerful, but to ensure the rights of all and to foster a society in which each of us is free to shape our future based on our abilities. The resolution today removes the deadline Congress put in place for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. While ratification of

the Equal Rights Amendment is imperative to enshrine equal rights for women, I do not believe it is necessary to strike the deadline for ratification. By voting on this legislation we may imply that it is necessary for Congress to lift a self-imposed deadline. I do not prescribe to this view.

Congressional authority to propose Amendments to the Constitution and the mode of ratification is absolute. The language of Article V of the Constitution represents the Founders intent to create a stable government designed for change. Article V requires two-thirds of the House and Senate to propose an amendment. Congress can choose ratification through three-fourths of the state legislatures or state ratifying conventions. Once the amendment is proposed to the states, there is no Constitutionally imposed time limit on the ratification process. Article V of the Constitution is silent with regard to when a state must consider and ratify an amendment. For example, the ratification process for the 27th Amendment took more than two hundred years.

Historically, Congress has ratified amendments without specific time limitations. The first amendment to contain a time limit was the 18th Amendment which established the prohibition of alcohol. The text of the 18th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd Amendments each contained language limiting the time frame for ratification. In contrast, the text of the Equal Rights Amendment ratified by the states does not contain a time limit. It is the proposing clause sent to the states for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment which contains a seven-year time limitation. The language of a proposing clause is not binding. The current ratification process of the Equal Rights Amendment is properly before the states and is reasonable and sufficiently contemporaneous.

Having been ratified by Virginia, according to Article V, the ERA has become part of the Constitution. Furthermore, if the deadline is binding, then passage of this resolution, without passage in the Senate, does not cure the defect. Because the deadline is not binding, this resolution is not necessary, but also not harmful.

Women continue to face additional hurdles in the pathways to success. On average, women still earn less than men for the same job functions. Pregnant women often lack basic protections and reasonable accommodation in the workplace. Perhaps most concerning of all, violence against women is still widespread and undermines the educational and social potential of women and young children in this country.

I am proud to have worked with my Democratic colleagues in the House to pass legislation to remedy these inequalities. The House recently passed the Protect the Right to Organize Act (H.R. 2474) which protects workers who are trying to form a union. In most of America, women earn less than men, but women and men working under a union contract receive equal pay for equal work. We have worked to fill the gaps in the patchwork of existing laws governing how and when workers take time off to care for themselves and their families. Expanding the Family and Medical Leave Act to cover more working parents and low wage workers who are currently excluded from leave policies is a top priority.

Nearly two thirds of minimum wage workers in the United States are women. The House has successfully passed the Raise the Wage

Act (H.R. 582). This will raise the income levels of the most economically insecure households and is a step in the right direction towards pay equity. The Pregnant Worker's Fairness Act (H.R. 2694) is an important piece of legislation that will provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant women in the workforce. The House also passed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (H.R. 1585) which expanded protections and provides critical funding for victim services, law enforcement training, and data collection.

However, even if all this legislation were to become law, it would not be the same as amending the Constitution to guarantee women equal rights.

Discrimination in the workplace, violence in the home, and institutional barriers require systemic legal and cultural change. Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment provides an additional legal tool for combatting discrimination on the basis of sex.

We will continue the fight for equality and work towards a more inclusive and equitable society.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, over the course of many years, I have consistently sponsored and promoted women's rights legislation to ensure equal pay for equal work including most recently, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

In the struggle against wage discrimination, I voted in favor of 2009 the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

To help ensure that women are not disadvantaged in their careers because of time taken to attend to their families, I was an early and strong advocate of multiple legislative initiatives to provide family medical leave—including the groundbreaking bill that became law, the Family and Medical Leave Act.

And this year, I have cosponsored the FAMILY Act.

I voted to ensure that women's rights are protected in higher education by strongly supporting Title IX.

I have supported legislation to amend pension and tax policies that negatively impact women and I supported numerous bills to establish certain rights for sexual assault survivors including the Survivors' Bill of Rights which is now law.

Since the mid-1990s, I have led the effort to end the barbaric practice of human trafficking, a human rights abuse that is a perverted and unimaginable exploitation of women and girls that thrives on greed, disrespect and secrecy.

Twenty years ago, the U.S. Congress approved and the President signed legislation that I authored—the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000—a comprehensive whole-of-government initiative to combat sex and labor trafficking in the United States and around the world.

The Violence Against Women Act (See Division B) was reauthorized and significantly expanded by my law. Last year, I cosponsored the Violence Against Women Extension Act of 2019.

This past January, I authored another bill that was signed into law—my fifth major law on human trafficking—The Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Act.

After a young college student from my district, Samantha Josephson, was brutally murdered by the driver of what she thought was her Uber ride, I introduced Sami's Law to

make the ride share safer for all. In recent months it has been shocking to learn that thousands of women who use Lyft or Uber have been sexually assaulted and some have been murdered.

I arrive at the debate on the elimination of the deadline for the ERA from the perspective of my work to ensure equality and protection for women and every woman's right to be treated fairly and without exploitation.

The words of Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg on the legal impermissibility of extending the deadline for ratification have sealed the fate of the proposed amendment. Justice Ginsburg's judgment is that the deadline has expired and that she "would like it to start over" presents a definitive view that the process has come to an end.

According to Vox, Justice Ginsburg also said "There's too much controversy about latecomers, plus, a number of states have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard states that said 'we've changed our minds?'" Five states—Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, Tennessee, and South Dakota—voted to ratify the ERA but later rescinded that ratification.

Today, however, one thing is absolutely clear from both sides of the abortion divide: ratification of the ERA with its current wording will likely overturn laws prohibiting public funding of abortion—like the Hyde Amendment—and undo modest restrictions on abortion including waiting periods, parental involvement, women's right to know laws, conscience rights including the Weldon Amendment and any ban on late term abortion including the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Should the ERA be ratified without clarifying abortion-neutral language—to wit: "Nothing in this Article shall be construed to grant or secure any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof"—abortion activists will use the ERA as they have successfully used state ERAs in both New Mexico and Connecticut—to force taxpayers to pay for abortion on demand.

Consider this:

The Supreme Court of New Mexico ruled in 1998 that the state was required to fund abortion based solely on the state ERA and said the law "undoubtedly singles out . . . a gender-linked condition that is unique to women" and therefore "violates the Equal Rights Amendment."

In like manner, the Supreme Court of Connecticut invalidated its state ban on abortion funding and wrote in 1986: "it is therefore clear, under the Connecticut ERA, that the regulation excepting . . . abortions from the Medicaid program discriminates against women."

Today in Pennsylvania, activists are suing to eviscerate the abortion funding restriction in that state claiming that the Hyde-type restriction violates the Pennsylvania Equal Rights Amendment.

While I take issue with abortion activists who refuse to recognize an unborn child's inherent dignity, worth and value, at least activists on both sides agree that the ERA as written will be used in court as a means to compel public funding of abortion and to strike down the Hyde Amendment and other modest abortion restrictions at both the state and federal level.

NARAL Pro-Choice America plainly states: "With its ratification, the ERA . . . would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws . . ."

A senior lawyer of the National Women's Law Centers said: "The ERA would help create a basis to challenge abortion restrictions."

The National Right to Life Committee states that "the proposed federal ERA would invalidate the federal Hyde Amendment and all state restrictions on tax-funded abortions."

And the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops agree and wrote "One consequence of the ERA would be the likely requirement of federal funding for abortions . . . (and) arguments have been proffered that the federal ERA would . . . restrain the ability of the federal and state governments to enact other measures regulating abortion, such as third-trimester or partial birth abortion bans, parental consent, informed consent, conscience-related exemptions, and other provisions."

According to the most recent Marist Poll (January 2020), 60 percent of all Americans oppose using tax dollars for abortion, seven in ten Americans including nearly half who identify as pro-choice want significant restrictions on abortion, a majority of Americans—55 percent—want to ban abortion after 20 weeks, and nearly two-thirds of Americans oppose abortion if the child will be born with Down Syndrome.

I believe that all human beings—especially the weakest and most vulnerable including unborn baby girls and boys—deserve respect, empathy, compassion and protection from violence.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 79, which will remove a deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. This will ensure that our country fully accepts the impact of the recent ratifications by the states of Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia.

The Equal Rights Amendment represents the further advancement of women in our society. It enshrines the American ideal that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex". While other existing statutes have been interpreted as prohibiting some forms of sex discrimination, there are still numerous avenues in which they are inefficient for the full protection of women under the law.

As representatives of communities across our nation, we must set an explicit example of our championing of women's rights. Women continue to face obstacles to their full equality, including through unequal pay, pregnancy discrimination, sexual and domestic violence, and inadequate access to health care services. As the United States, we must be mindful of the global influence we have, and we must ensure that gender equality is, without a doubt, enshrined in our foundational principles.

The bipartisan support of this legislation captures the will of Americans for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Therefore, I am proud to support this resolution as a crucial step forward for gender equality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I make the point of order that a two-thirds vote is required for passage of this joint resolution because it does have the effect of amending the Constitution.

And on the point of order, Madam Speaker, there was an extension that was passed in 1978, where this issue came up, which extended the deadline until 1982.

In 1982, the Equal Rights Amendment deadlines expired. In 1983, Chairman Peter Rodino, of the Judiciary Committee, decided to introduce H.J. Res. 1, which started the process over again.

The difference between what happened in 1978 and 1983 is that Chairman Rodino, and those who supported re-introducing and attempting to pass the Equal Rights Amendment, realized that it had expired and required a start-over.

I believe that this does fall under that, and that it does require a start-over, and I would ask the Chair to rule on whether or not the point of order is well-taken and this does require a two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Pursuant to House Resolution 842, an affirmative vote of a majority of Members present and voting, a quorum being present, is required on final passage of the pending measure. The gentleman's point of order is overruled.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I appeal the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The terms of House Resolution 842 are unambiguous and so, consistent with the ruling of the Chair on September 16, 1977, to permit an appeal in this case would be tantamount to permitting a direct change in that resolution. As such, the Chair has not issued an appealable ruling, and the Chair will put the question on passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I appeal that ruling of the Chair as well, which I believe is appealable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That ruling is not subject to appeal.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—232

Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Golden	Omar
Axne	Gomez	Pallone
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta
Bass	Gottheimer	Pappas
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Pascrell
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Haaland	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Phillips
Bonamici	Heck	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
F.	Himes	Porter
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Houlihan	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Raskin
Butterfield	Huffman	Reed
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Case	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ryan
Ciçilline	Khanna	Sánchez
Cisneros	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Cohen	Lamb	Schrier
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Correa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Craig	Lee (NV)	Sherrill
Crist	Levin (CA)	Sires
Crow	Levin (MI)	Slotkin
Cuellar	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Curtis	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Loebsock	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stanton
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Stevens
Davis, Rodney	Lowey	Suozi
Dean	Luján	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luria	Takano
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Malinowski	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Maloney,	Titus
Delgado	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Deutch	McAdams	Torres Small
Dingell	McBath	(NM)
Doggett	McCollum	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Trone
F.	McGovern	Underwood
Engel	McNerney	Van Drew
Escobar	Meeks	Vargas
Eshoo	Meng	Veasey
Espallat	Moore	Vela
Evans	Morelle	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Moulton	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	Mucarsel-Powell	Wasserman
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Foster	Nadler	Waters
Frankel	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Neal	Wexton
Gallego	Neguse	Wild
Garamendi	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	O'Halleran	Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Abraham	Bilirakis	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bishop (NC)	Chabot
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Cheney
Amash	Bost	Cline
Amodei	Brady	Cloud
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Babin	Buchanan	Comer
Bacon	Buck	Conaway
Baird	Bucshon	Cook
Balderson	Budd	Crenshaw
Banks	Burchett	Davidson (OH)
Barr	Burgess	DesJarlais
Bergman	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Biggs	Carter (GA)	Duncan

Dunn	Kelly (MS)	Rose, John W.
Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Estes	King (IA)	Roy
Ferguson	King (NY)	Rutherford
Fleischmann	Kustoff (TN)	Scalise
Flores	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Foxx (NC)	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Fulcher	Lesko	Shimkus
Gaetz	Long	Simpson
Gallagher	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Gianforte	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	Marshall	Smucker
Gonzalez (OH)	Massie	Spano
Gooden	McCarthy	Stauber
Gosar	McCaul	Stefanik
Granger	McClintock	Steil
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Steube
Graves (MO)	McKinley	Stewart
Green (TN)	Meadows	Stivers
Griffith	Meuser	Taylor
Grothman	Miller	Thompson (PA)
Guest	Mitchell	Thornberry
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Timmons
Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Harris	Murphy (NC)	Turner
Hartzler	Newhouse	Upton
Hern, Kevin	Norman	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Walberg
Hice (GA)	Olson	Walden
Higgins (LA)	Palazzo	Walker
Hill (AR)	Palmer	Walorski
Holding	Pence	Waltz
Hollingsworth	Perry	Watkins
Hudson	Posey	Weber (TX)
Huizenga	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)
Hurd (TX)	Reschenthaler	Wenstrup
Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Johnson (OH)	Riggleman	Williams
Johnson (SD)	Roby	Wittman
Jordan	Rodgers (WA)	Womack
Joyce (OH)	Roe, David P.	Woodall
Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
Katko	Rogers (KY)	Young
Keller	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Adams	Kinzinger	Mullin
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	Payne
Crawford	LaHood	Welch
Gabbard	Marchant	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Mast	Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1119

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. LEE of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, due to a medical condition, I was unable to vote on the following Roll Call on February 13, 2020.

Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 70 (Final Passage of H.J. Res. 79)—Removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment (Rep. Speier—Judiciary).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 70.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HONORING MISS DAISY ELLIOTT

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, today, I stand here proud to say that I was one who cast my vote for the passage of ERA in America.

I also rise today to recognize a woman who was so very instrumental to the State of Michigan and its fight for civil rights, Miss Daisy Elliott.

Miss Elliott was only 1 of 11 women elected to the Michigan Constitutional Convention in 1961. She was key in ensuring that our State’s constitution established the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, with the authority to investigate charges of discrimination based on race, religion, color, or national origin.

Daisy served in the Michigan Legislature for nearly 20 years as an effective and influential voice of equality and introduced more than 80 bills that were enacted, including the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act. Daisy Elliott was a fierce advocate for workers, senior citizens, and people of color.

Today, in honor of Black History Month, I salute and honor Miss Daisy Elliott. Madam Speaker, I honor her legacy.

OBSERVING NATIONAL CHILDREN’S DENTAL HEALTH MONTH

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, February is National Children’s Dental Health Month. This month is a time when healthcare professionals, providers, and educators help promote good oral health practices to children, families, and many others.

Tooth decay is still the number one chronic infectious disease among children in the United States.

Throughout my career as a dentist, I can attest to the benefits of proper oral health and how important it is to focus on children from a very young age. Preventive measures like brushing, flossing, and rinsing correctly are important life lessons that should be learned from a young age.

I would also like to recognize the American Dental Association for their

strenuous work in this area. They have implemented the Give Kids A Smile program. It provides hundreds of thousands of underserved kids with free oral health education, screenings, and preventive and/or restorative services throughout the entire year.

It is a very much needed program, and I am personally very proud of the American Dental Association for the work that they do in this area.

SUPPORT MEDICAID EXPANSION, NOT BLOCK GRANTS

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on the issue of healthcare in Oklahoma. I hear from far too many Oklahomans who can’t afford the healthcare they need.

Today, Oklahoma has the second highest rate of uninsured people in the Nation. Our State ranks 48th for uninsured children. We cannot continue to let Oklahomans fall through the cracks of our healthcare system.

The answer to solving our State’s healthcare crisis is straightforward. We must expand Medicaid. By not expanding Medicaid, Oklahoma has lost up to \$1 billion per year. Seven hospitals across our State have closed, in part because we did not accept the healthcare support our State is entitled to.

Expanding Medicaid in Oklahoma would extend health insurance to up to 200,000 Oklahomans who don’t currently have insurance. It is the right choice for our State. Instead, the administration and our Governor are proposing an alternative plan to turn SoonerCare into a block grant program.

The plan to block grant Medicaid would encourage cuts to healthcare services, restrict access to healthcare providers and lifesaving medications, and contribute to hospital closures. Too often, block grants have often been misused for political pet projects and to fill holes in the budget.

While we are still learning the specifics of the block grant plan, here is what we do know: more than 500,000 children rely on SoonerCare, and their insurance would be threatened by the plan to cap and slash Medicaid. Enough is enough.

CONGRATULATING DALLAS HIGH SCHOOL MOUNTAINEERS

(Mr. MEUSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dallas High School Mountaineers football team for their outstanding championship season.

Dallas football went undefeated during their regular season, going 15-0 with playoff wins and a district championship.

For the first time since 1993, the Dallas Mountaineers made it all the way to a Pennsylvania State championship.

Back in 2016, Dallas football went 2–9, with 12 freshmen on the team. Three years later, these players led their team to a championship season.

Under the leadership of the one and only coach Richie Mannello and his great assistant coaches, Dallas was strong on all sides of the ball, with a great gang-tackling defense, a super-solid offensive line, an electrifying passing game, and a backfield I will never forget.

The Dallas Mountaineer parents, student body, band, and cheerleaders were a huge part of the Friday night victories, and they made the games an awful lot of fun. The entire community, restaurants, fire department, all the residents of the Back Mountain were all part of this great season.

We are going to miss these boys wearing Dallas blue under the Friday night lights, but we know the Dallas tradition, long established, will live on.

□ 1130

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLUE DOG COALITION

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Blue Dog Coalition, a caucus of pragmatic Democrats I have the honor to help lead this Congress.

Since February 1995, the Blue Dog Coalition has been working to bridge partisan divide and deliver bipartisan results. While the makeup and size of our coalition has changed over the years, our focus on fiscal responsibility and a strong national security has never wavered.

Blue Dogs recognize that our constituents expect us to be good stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars and that a skyrocketing national debt is a threat to our national security.

Over the last 25 years, Blue Dogs have helped deliver balanced budgets, end government shutdowns, grow the middle class, and pass commonsense laws, such as pay-as-you-go.

This Congress we are leading the fight on election security, infrastructure, and job creation, and we are pushing Congress to be better by ending partisan gerrymandering and proposing No Budget, No Pay.

Most importantly, Blue Dogs remain focused on our founding principles of fiscal responsibility and a strong national security.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the Blue Dog Coalition's 25th anniversary this month.

CELEBRATING MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

(Mr. WALTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate one of the most prominent African American women in my community and our Nation's history, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune.

At an early age, Dr. Bethune took an interest in the power of learning and promoting civil rights. In 1904, Dr. Bethune opened the Daytona Literary and Industrial Training School for Negro Girls in Daytona Beach, which later merged with the Cookman Institute for Men in Jacksonville to form Bethune-Cookman College, now University, where she served as president.

As Dr. Bethune worked to build the school she founded, she also became a national leader on issues related to civil rights, women, and young people, even providing counsel to U.S. Presidents.

In 2018, the Florida legislature passed and the governor signed legislation to place a statue in her honor representing Florida in the National Statuary Hall collection here in the Capitol.

Dr. Bethune knew education is the key to a quality life and a better life, and it is my honor to recognize her contributions on the floor here today.

DRAWING ATTENTION TO THE TRAGEDY UNFOLDING IN IDLIB, SYRIA

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I rise to draw attention to the tragedy unfolding in Idlib, Syria.

The regime backed by Iran and Russia continues to target civilians. They target hospitals and other civilian infrastructure. Just drop bombs. They are levelling whole neighborhoods, which is indicative that the regime does not want people to return to their homes. They are killing innocent men, women, and children for no reason.

Over half a million people have been displaced in the last 2 months. There must be a humanitarian response from the world, and it must start here in the United States. There must be accountability, and we must show the Syrian people that we have not forgotten them. How can we stand idly by and allow this to continue to happen?

I call on the President and all Members of both houses to have a forceful response to the regime in Syria to say that we will not tolerate the targeting of civilians, the wholesale killing of children and women and all civilians. We need to stand on the side of justice, and we must show the Syrian people that we have not forgotten them.

CELEBRATING OREGON'S 161ST BIRTHDAY

(Mr. WALDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, on February 14, Oregon celebrates her 161st birthday. As a lifelong Oregonian whose ancestors came there by wagon train in 1845, I may be a little biased, but I can confidently say there is no place like Oregon.

She boasts of so many unparalleled wonders and sights from the mighty, powerful Columbia River and the winds of the Columbia River Gorge to the majestic Painted Hills to the rugged landscape of the Umatilla National Forest, the clear, deep blue waters of Crater Lake, the deepest lake in North America. Then think about the great Cascade Mountains or Steens Mountain or the Wallows or the Blues, and then all the way down to the depths of Hells Canyon.

The late great Republican Governor Tom McCall said it best. He said, "Oregon is an inspiration. Whether you come to it, or are born to it, you become entranced by our State's beauty, the opportunity she affords, and the independent spirit of her citizens."

Madam Speaker, I wish a happy birthday to Oregon. She truly does fly with her own wings.

REMEMBERING SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, it has been 2 years since the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

In those 2 years, the surviving families and students have turned their pain into power. They stood up to gun companies. They testified before Congress. They helped craft and pass legislation. They worked with the Federal Government. They worked with the State government. They won school board seats. They made beautiful, moving art. Students have lifted their voices, written songs. They have walked out and they have marched. That is what the survivors of my community are doing.

But there is so much more that Congress and the President can do to save lives from gun violence. There is so much more we can do to honor the lives that were lost at Stoneman Douglas: Alyssa, Scott, Martin, Nicholas, Aaron, Jaime, Chris, Luke, Cara, Gina, Joaquin, Alaina, Meadow, Helena, Alex, Carmen, and Peter.

RECOGNIZING SWEETWATER
SOUND

(Mr. BANKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share one of Fort Wayne's great American success stories, Sweetwater Sound.

Founder and CEO Chuck Surack's dream started over 40 years ago with a recording studio housed in a Volkswagen van. It has since evolved into one of the Nation's leading retailers of professional recording and music equipment.

Madam Speaker, Sweetwater's total sales in 2018 were record breaking at \$725 million. And just recently we found out that in 2019 it was another record year with sales of \$805 million, up 11 percent from 2018.

The total sales only tell part of the success story, though. Sweetwater has recently hired 159 new employees and has given back to Hoosiers by providing middle school students with free instruments.

Hoosiers are thankful for Sweetwater Sound's big contributions to northeast Indiana, and I look forward to watching them continue to succeed moving forward. In this record-setting economy, I look forward to seeing more American success stories just like this one.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CANNOT AFFORD TO TURN A
BLIND EYE TO THE HUMANITARIAN
CRISIS IN SYRIA

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I stand today with the chair of our Foreign Affairs Committee who just spoke here, Mr. ENGEL, as he makes a plea to this House for us to take a look at and get involved with what is going on in Syria.

Millions of folks are dying. They are being killed with the help of Assad and Russia. They are killing civilians, millions of civilians. They are killing the children. And for those who are injured that find their way to the hospital, it does no good because they turn around and bomb the hospitals. This is an outrage.

The United States of America cannot afford to turn a blind eye to this humanitarian crisis. We must get involved. We must pay attention. The families, the children, the people of Syria deserve better than this.

I want to thank Mr. ENGEL for the attention that he is paying to this issue and the way that he is trying to educate us and get us involved in saving those poor people who are being overrun, who are being killed by Assad and, of course, with the help of Russia.

RECOGNIZING ABC LIFE CENTER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ABC Life Center, a pregnancy center in Franklin, Pennsylvania in Venango County.

The Life Center offers pregnant women a wide variety of resources, including no-cost pregnancy tests, consultations for women with unexpected pregnancies, adoption referrals, counseling for women who have had a pregnancy end in miscarriage or abortion, and more.

The Life Center recognizes that being pro-life means supporting all life. The center itself encourages women by letting them know that their story, their life and their babies' lives matter. The center also dispels the notion that to be pro-life is to be antichoice.

In fact, pregnancy centers such as Life Center offer a great deal of choices and resources to women who find themselves unexpectedly pregnant.

Pregnancy centers like ABC Life Center encourage and empower women all around the country. I am proud of the work that they do every day to enrich the lives of women and children, and together they help spread the message that life really is a better choice.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE
UNITED STATES—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-
99)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the southern border of the United States declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond February 15, 2020.

The ongoing border security and humanitarian crisis at the southern border of the United States continues to threaten our national security, including the security of the American people. The executive branch has taken steps to address the crisis, but further action is needed to address the humanitarian crisis and to control unlawful

migration and the flow of narcotics and criminals across the southern border. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Proclamation 9844 concerning the southern border of the United States.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 2020.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be able to stand in this hallowed Hall and address some things that have occurred that are worthy of attention.

Of course, there was applause in the gallery today on the passage of trying to restart the ERA. It is an amendment to the Constitution, and it was started back in the seventies. The amendment to the Constitution had a deadline as part of the amendment. The amendment did not get the required 38 states. The time lapsed. There was, as I recall, an attempt to extend the time, but some States that had been in favor of the ERA backed off.

□ 1145

So it is very clear to anyone who pays attention to the Constitution that, when an amendment to the Constitution by its own wording has a time deadline and that deadline is passed, then that amendment has not been ratified, is not part of the Constitution, and any efforts to change the amendment itself, including the deadline for ratification, would require beginning again.

There is no more iconic liberal judge on the Supreme Court, not in history, than the former head, as I recall, of the American Civil Liberties Union. She was there back when the American Civil Liberties Union cared deeply about civil liberties and even took on some clients and some causes of people that most of us thought were not worthy of a lot of attention. But they were so committed to civil liberties back in those days, they were more concerned about civil liberties than they were the client. That was in the old days.

Now, if it is not a liberal, then they are not concerned about civil liberties and abuses, since the Obama administration was the administration that so far appears to be the most abusive of the FISA courts, committing fraud upon the FISA courts.

But in fairness to the administration, it appears the FISA court judges did not have sufficient integrity or pride in their position that they were offended by having fraud committed upon them, because, apparently, the disdain for Donald Trump, then President Trump and his administration was such that it was okay. They were okay to be defrauded as judges, which sure brings

the issue of the FISA courts into focus as that issue will be taken up, as I understand it, as will issues over parts of the PATRIOT Act and other provisions that give the Federal Government tremendous latitude to spy on American citizens.

So it is an interesting time, though, where you never know where judges are going to come down. If somebody was appointed by a liberal judge, it is amazing; they appear to stay liberal, with disdain for conservatism and the strict language of the Constitution, wanting it to be a liberal, breathing, living document.

On the other hand, Chief Justice Roberts has pointed out he doesn't believe there should be Obama judges or Trump judges or Bush judges because you can't characterize them that way.

To an extent, he is right about that, because there are some Justices, particularly on the Supreme Court, who have been appointed by conservative Presidents who were liberals in conservative clothing, and they got on the Court and became some of the biggest flaming liberals we have ever had.

So you can't tell that someone is conservative if they are appointed by a conservative President, but you sure can tell if somebody is appointed by a liberal President. They have shown that they will stay liberal and not change. So it has been interesting to see that kind of conversion.

It appears pretty clear that some of these Justices, including Chief Justice Roberts, got into the position and began to care deeply about what the media and others thought about things they were doing.

So, for example, with ObamaCare, he was, apparently, from the reports, concerned that he might go down in history as being too political of a Chief Justice if he struck down ObamaCare. So he took something that was clearly unconstitutional, in effect, rewrote it, and had a very hypocritical opinion.

At page 14, I believe it was, he said, clearly, this is not a tax, because if it were a tax, Congress would have called it a tax, and they made clear it was not; and it is only a penalty, a fine, if you don't conform your conduct to the requirements of the legislation. Therefore, it is not a tax.

Since it is not a tax, then the anti-injunction law that prevents a plaintiff from filing suit until a tax is not only assessed but paid and keeps the court from having jurisdiction to hear it until the tax is assessed and paid, that doesn't apply, so the court can take this matter up. And now that we take it up, 40 pages later, he said it is constitutional, in effect, because it is a tax.

So he had to go through all kinds of mental gymnastics to what, in his mind, would prevent him from being classified as a political Chief Justice; but, as a result, he has become one of the most political Chief Justices we have ever had—unfortunately for him and the country.

So who knows. Maybe there will be people on the Supreme Court who will decide to rewrite the Constitution as he, in effect, rewrote the ObamaCare statute. But if you are actually going to follow the Constitution the way it is written and you are not going to rewrite the Constitution at the Supreme Court level, then the truth is, when an amendment fails by its own language and is not ratified, then anybody with any sense would understand you have got to start over.

Though I have plenty of disagreements with Justice Ginsberg over some issues, she has tried to be a person of integrity. Talking about the ERA, she says:

I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like it to start over. There is too much controversy about latecomers—Virginia—long after the deadline passed. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard the States that said, "We have changed our minds"?

So it is interesting. Yes, this legislation passed.

JIM SENSENBRENNER from Wisconsin appropriately brought up the point that this is actually amending the Constitution; it is amending the constitutional amendment. So, to be appropriate, it is going to require a two-thirds vote in the House, a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and then 38 States, I believe it is, in order to have it ratified.

That was overruled to reinforce the fact that what we did today is really not constitutional. If we had tried to ratify it as a new amendment, like Justice Ginsberg was talking about, a new constitutional amendment, then, actually, you would, as Justice Ginsberg said, have to be starting the process all over again, and that does require a two-thirds vote here and in the Senate.

So what we did today made people that support it feel good, but it is not going anywhere; and even if it were, hypothetically, it just simply can't pass constitutional muster at the Supreme Court. A majority of the Court appears to believe that the Constitution means what it says.

We had one vote today. It was on the ERA. So we didn't do anything terribly effective today as the House of Representatives.

Also, I noted before I came over for the vote that, apparently, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it was reported—I don't know if other members of the majority signed the letter, but there was a letter to Attorney General Barr, and it expressed what sounded like the distress of the committee over Attorney General Barr's action in reining in prosecutors who have simply gotten out of hand.

Attorney General Barr has the distinct advantage of having a bigger picture than these four very politically motivated prosecutors who were pushing so hard for virtually the maximum amount of time for Roger Stone to serve in prison.

Anyway, if that letter was going to be truly accurate, it needed to say that this majority that has been trying to throw President Trump out of office, that has been using taxpayer funds for a number of years now to try to defeat President Trump in the 2020 election, which voted for impeachment knowing that President Trump was not going to be removed from office—so it seems the logical conclusion is, again, they were using taxpayer funds to campaign against President Trump, hoping they could besmirch him sufficiently, slander his name sufficiently, that it would help them defeat him in November.

Whereas, the minority of the committee did not agree with the letter because it appears clear to all of the minority I have talked to that Attorney General Barr is trying to do something and incorporate something called fairness in our legal system, because he has seen you had people in the previous administration who strong-armed salespeople into selling guns to people they knew should not have them and that they would end up in the hands of, most likely, Mexican drug cartels. And that is what the administration wanted to do. They were assuring they would be able to follow the guns and intercede, but that is not what happened.

Then we even saw emails that, after this was all exposed, there was an idea that, gee, maybe we can still use the fact that these guns went into criminal hands, even killed one of our own United States agents, a brave soul, Brian Terry, they were hopeful they could still use that to get antigun legislation passed simply based on their criminal activity in trying to get these guns into the hands of criminals who shouldn't have them.

So nobody was held accountable for that. Nobody was held accountable for the guns that were forced into the hands of criminals, ultimately, one of which killed Brian Terry. Nobody was held accountable for any of that.

Nobody was held accountable for destroying evidence after it was subpoenaed, even with a hammer, even with applications like BleachBit, destroying subpoenaed evidence. Nobody was held accountable for any of that.

So across the Nation, it appears maybe a small majority, but a majority, understand and believe that there are two forms of justice in America: one for those high-ranking Democratic officials who are never held accountable at all, and one for Republicans whose lives are attempted to be destroyed and, in some cases, are destroyed.

□ 1200

In some cases, they did nothing wrong. In other cases, they agreed to plead to something just because the bully Federal prosecutors have threatened to go after their family and continue to harass them.

I saw a former Member of Congress from Pennsylvania who had been blasting the FBI back during my first term,

2005–2006, and he was blasting them because he said—and I had not heard of it before, at the time—but a program called Able Danger had been able to identify a majority of the 9/11 hijackers. The FBI had that information. They did nothing with it.

I didn't know if Curt Weldon, the Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, was accurate in what he was saying, but hearing him make these speeches over and over about how the FBI should have acted. They could have prevented thousands of lives from being taken, all of those people from having to jump to their deaths because they didn't want to be burned at the top of the World Trade Center. All of that could have been avoided if the FBI had stepped in and used the information they had to stop 9/11.

I didn't know if that was true or not, but I was thinking, you know, Mueller and the FBI have to respond to Congressman Weldon in some way. They have to. This is really serious stuff. I thought they would make a statement and that they would come back with evidence to refute what he was saying, but they never did that.

What Mueller's FBI did, though—it had to be with his approval, going after a Member of Congress. It was believed that they got a warrant because they raided his daughter's law office. They alerted the media for the early morning raids so there was plenty of media there and plenty of media at his congressional office. People were apparently warned in advance by the FBI because nobody else knew.

They showed up with preprinted signs condemning Curt Weldon, caught red-handed, all of this stuff. It turned out, there was nothing ever done. He told me that, months later, he was contacted by the FBI and told: You can come get all of this material we seized in the raid.

They did the raid 2 weeks before the election, as I recall, about 2 weeks before the election. So the FBI, under Mueller, was able to singlehandedly defeat Curt Weldon. It helped the Democrat opponent to defeat Curt Weldon in the narrow loss that he had.

So the FBI didn't respond with evidence. They just helped manipulate the election system so Curt Weldon would lose. He did, and he said that they told him to come pick up all of this stuff. They never did present it to a grand jury anyway. That was kind of shocking.

So, clearly, Mueller and his FBI were motivated by shutting him up so he couldn't make speeches on the House floor anymore, and that is why the raid was conducted. But in his last most recent visit, Curt was telling me that—by the way, before I wrote about Curt Weldon, I had not seen him nor talked with him since 2006 when he left. I put that in the booklet I wrote titled "Robert Mueller: Unmasked." I wrote about what happened to Curt.

At this most recent visit this year, he told me that, as he understands, it

turns out the FBI never even got a warrant. They just raided the office without a warrant, like any good dictator would have, the brownshirts. Law enforcement does, in places: We don't need a stinking warrant. We will just go harass and destroy.

That is really shocking if there was not even a warrant. But Mueller was irritated, apparently, with Ted Stevens, so the FBI framed Ted Stevens. It turned out, after he was convicted right before his election—he lost narrowly as a U.S. Senator—an FBI agent filed an affidavit and established how they had created a case against Ted Stevens that didn't exist.

Actually, Ted Stevens had overpaid for improvements to his home. It wasn't an illegal gift. He had overpaid, at one point telling the contractor: Look, I know I am overpaying, but I have people watching. I have to do everything by the book, so just cash the check—that kind of thing.

Anyway, Mueller and his FBI helped defeat Ted Stevens by convicting him right before his election. But then that conviction was thrown out due to the prosecutorial misconduct and, I would say, crimes committed by at least one FBI agent, if not more, and also by prosecutors.

They should have gone to prison for what they did, but I can't help but think that between what the FBI did to Curt Weldon, what they did to Ted Stevens, what they have done to other people with whom they disagree, that it had become a very dangerous place where, if you were in the right political persuasion or took the right positions on the right issues, then you could commit crimes, and the FBI would leave you alone.

If you were of the wrong political positions, on the wrong issues, they would come after you even if they had to frame you or set you up, as they did Ted Stevens and Curt Weldon, destroying their political careers.

So we are at a very dangerous time in this country's history. It used to be that the FBI had the reputation that it was the most trustworthy, effective law enforcement agency body in the world. But that has changed.

Unfortunately, we have an FBI Director—an article said, at one time, back in the Bush administration, he had told James Comey, who has lied, obviously committed crimes—and we can debate about how high or low of a level. But he told Comey: Look, if you and Mueller are going to make a move, I want to be with you guys. I want to go where you are going, when you are going.

Well, that guy who thought so highly of Mueller and Comey was put in a place he never should have been, and that is FBI Director at a time that needed cleaning up.

So I am hopeful that in the days, weeks, or months ahead, we will get a new FBI Director who will be serious about punishing wrongdoing in the FBI, which I believe will help them get back their reputation.

The more Christopher Wray appears to do more covering up than he does making accountable, he really needs to go sooner rather than later. They are not going to get their reputation back simply by ignoring things.

Of course, the FISA court pointed out in an order, after going for years without having any pride or integrity in enforcing their jurisdiction and being offended by fraud upon the court, it finally came out and said: Okay, this one guy, Clinesmith, had changed the wording, basically going from saying he did work for the U.S. Government or the CIA to saying he did not.

So, clearly, 180 degrees opposite of what the truth was, knowing it was false, he submitted it to the court. But that had been clear for months, if not years, and the courts did nothing.

It is what keeps compelling me to think maybe we just need to get rid of the FISA court system and come up with a new way, because I am not sure that the court with the judges who have been appointed to be FISA judges, that we can save that system, that Americans can feel comfortable that their privacy and their civil rights are not being violated by an overzealous group, especially when you look at the thousands and thousands of FISA orders. In 2018, out of mass applications for warrants from the FISA court, I think there was only one they turned down.

Some say: Well, maybe if we have an amicus, a friend of the court who will stand up for the party against whom a warrant is sought, maybe that would help provide enough protection for American civil liberties.

But then we saw in December, I believe it was, FISA court, feeling the heat of all of those who have come to distrust FISA courts, appointed an amicus. It turned out the judge appointed the very lawyer who for years had been trashing DEVIN NUNES and others, who it turns out were 100 percent right in the things they said in their report.

So it appeared clear that the FISA court was not serious about making fixes or changes or protecting civil liberties, but also it had gone into the Christopher Wray mode of covering up, hoping people wouldn't notice that so much illegality and impropriety had been going on.

We are going to be taking up these issues, the controversial section 215 from the PATRIOT Act and other things. Hopefully, we will take up the FISA court.

I am hopeful that we will have bipartisan action because I know from my time on the Judiciary Committee, there have been Democrats—previously, Chairman NADLER had been a staunch proponent of protecting civil liberties, but that appears to be more, nowadays, only protecting civil liberties if you are a Democrat, but not so much if you are part of the Trump administration or a friend of the President.

Hopefully, we can get past some of that and do some good and actually do the job of protecting civil liberties.

I have talked to Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN over the years, including more recently, because she, in the past, has been quite zealous for civil liberties. I understand she has a bill. Hopefully, that will be helpful in dealing with some of these issues.

But I am still concerned that the abuses may have grown so profound that we may not be able to fix the FISA court system. We may need to do as some have said—I think RAND PAUL has talked about just getting rid of it. But we will see where we go.

That same kind of duality justice or dual justice has raised its ugly head in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. Jessie Liu was the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and she had some people, it turns out, who were extremely partisan.

In fact, in a case involving Imran Awan, an IT technician here, involved with working with computers for dozens of Democrats on Capitol Hill—since 2004, he had worked, like I say, for dozens of Democratic Representatives. And it is one of the things up here on the Hill, if a Member of Congress tells you, “Oh, this is my computer person. He is great. She is great,” then others will say, “oh, I need somebody, so I will hire them.”

Normally, somebody who does that, since you don't need them full time, they work part time. Under the rules, they are allowed to work for multiple offices as long as their income does not exceed the maximum amount allowed—I think it was around \$170,000, something like that. You could work for multiple offices and accumulate up to that maximum. You can have multiple part-time employees. Apparently, that is what Imran Awan did, and he had a brother.

If you are going to do that kind of work, you have to file financial information, financial statement information. It turns out, he didn't disclose about selling cars or some of the assets or businesses he had, and that is a Federal felony.

□ 1215

He also had filed under the requirements here if you buy something, and I think it is \$500 or more, then you have to have the serial number, you have to keep track of it, and you have to be able to document where that item is at all times if it costs more than \$500.

When I came into office in 2005, there was some couch that was on my inventory. Nobody had seen the couch in many years, but I was told you can't take it off your inventory because it is part of your office. Well, if it had cost less than \$500 then that would not have been an issue. I have no idea where that couch was or is. It wasn't around when I got here.

But Imran Awan, apparently to get around the requirement of keeping se-

rial numbers and keeping track of things that he purchased allegedly on behalf of Congress Members for whom he worked, he would list iPads that cost \$799 as costing \$499 and then say that an insurance policy for it cost \$300, and that way it got around the requirement of keeping information on where those specific items were.

It turns out from, what I have read, it appears he and his brother owed six figures to somebody foreign, I believe. And so instead of paying the person back, they put this guy, who was not a computer technician—just had various Members, oh, apparently he told them, this guy is going to help with your computer system, so we need you to put him on part-time for your office. So he had the Federal taxpayers paying their debt to this guy.

It turns out he had two wives, and one was saying he had a tremendous amount of money. He is from Pakistan, and when he goes back, he is treated like a king by the secret police there, I believe it was ISI. He is constantly sending all kinds of computer equipment back to Pakistan since he was a Pakistan national.

Anyway, he had some ties with some very questionable people. It sounds like maybe the FISA court should have been issuing warrants to look at some of his stuff.

He was arrested in July of 2017 over his alleged involvement in double charging House Democrats for House IT equipment, House computer-type equipment, and privately exposing private information online. A probe of him found more than tens of thousands of dollars in computer technical equipment had been stolen.

He was indicted by a Federal District Court in August of 2017 for “conspiracy to commit bank fraud, bank fraud, making false statements on a loan or credit application, and engaging in unlawful monetary transactions.”

As I recall, he had, I believe it was a cousin who worked at McDonald's. He got him listed on the payroll for different House Members. I am sure they didn't know that he wasn't working. So he helped out the family by bringing in extra income for family members. Each one of those events would have been a Federal felony.

Evidence indicates that Imran Awan and his team members were copying data from the computers of House Members to the House Democratic Caucus server and then even to private Dropbox accounts—totally inappropriate and absolute wrongdoing.

He and his associates were even tossed off the House computer system because they provided false information to Capitol Police that being a fake copy of the Democratic Caucus' server. But incredibly none of that was used by Jessie Liu's attorneys against him. Instead, the U.S. Attorney's office for the District of Columbia opted to let him plead to a charge of just making a false statement on a loan application, disregarding the many, many felonies

that could have been charged and pursued to just find out: Why are you such a hero back in Pakistan?

What equipment are you sending back there?

Where are you getting it from?

How come you committed a felony by not listing your car dealership?

Because as our intel people can tell you, Madam Speaker, one of the ways that money is raised for terrorist activity is through bogus car dealerships where cars are stolen and then shipped. We don't know what the situation was with Imran Awan's alleged car dealership because he didn't have a dealer lot anywhere.

It is handy, though, no matter who you are, if you can have taxpayers pay back your loans by just listing them on the payroll of people whom you lied to about who is doing the work.

The problem, though, if Jessie Liu and these Democrat attorneys in the D.C. U.S. Attorneys' Office had pursued Imran for anything other than making a false statement on his loan, then there would have been a lot of embarrassment for Democratic Members of Congress because they had some guy like that who was cheating taxpayers, cheating the government, and committing crimes working for them. In fairness, it is hard to believe they would have known the kinds of things he was doing and getting away with. Anyway, the Federal judge sentenced him.

He filed saying he was broke, and he had no money. One of his wives said she was threatened by the FBI to keep her mouth shut, but she had indicated that he had all kinds of money. He had gold, and he had all kinds of money that he had been able to save while working for all these different Members of Congress. But he said he was broke. He filed something saying he was broke, and he couldn't pay anything. But then it came down to, in order to get probation he had to pay back six figures to the government. Somehow, he magically came up—I can't remember if it was 100 or \$200,000—he came up with it. He paid it, even though he alleged he was flat broke.

So when we hear about four Federal prosecutors who worked for U.S. Attorney of D.C. Jessie Liu being all upset over the Department of Justice wanting fairness for Roger Stone and not political vengeance, four of them quit. In analyzing who it is and what they were doing and why they quit, I think it is important to see who they are. There have been some good articles written about these people just in the last week.

Jonathan Kravis was appointed by former President Obama to be associate White House Counsel where he served in 2009 and 2010. He worked for Williams & Connolly, a lobbying firm for which Kravis had worked. It has a long history of its employees donating large sums of money to Democratic candidates, organizations, and causes.

He worked with Adam Jed to prosecute Paul Manafort. They went after

him with a vengeance for working for the Ukrainian Government. Manafort was cleared of all charges except two counts of conspiracy to defraud the U.S., for which Manafort is serving a 5-year prison sentence.

Kravis and his wife are connected with Codepink that most people around here know is a far left, anti-war organization.

Then Adam Jed, himself, apparently did work in 2003 or was a fellow at Humanity in Action group, a far-left-wing organization blatantly against political diversity.

He defended the Affordable Care Act contraceptive mandate in the case *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Sebelius*. That is where the Federal Government was going after these nuns who took a vow of poverty but also a vow to help people, and they believed it was against their religion to help pay for abortions. Mr. Jed had no problem in pursuing these poor nuns. That is his choice, but it does give an indication of where he stood, and it is certainly not anywhere close to the beliefs on the pro-life positions of Donald Trump.

Adam Jed also provided oral arguments to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act in the *Defense of Marriage Act v. Windsor*.

He contributed \$1,000 to Josh Kaul's candidacy for Wisconsin State Attorney General. Of course, Kaul was a lawyer for Perkins Coie which funneled money from the Hillary Clinton campaign to Christopher Steele who was the British spy who also apparently utilized other foreigners to try to affect the U.S. election in 2016. So, obviously, Adam Jed would have been supporting Kaul who worked for Perkins Coie.

I know we don't hear a whole lot about it from the other side of the aisle, but the Hillary Clinton campaign and the DNC actually paid foreigners to try to affect our 2016 election.

I constantly hear about how outrageous it was that the now-debunked allegations that the Trump campaign conspired with Russia to affect our election, they don't want to talk about what is slam-dunk proved that the DNC and the Clinton campaign absolutely did pay foreigners to try to affect our election. One foreigner from Italy was involved and a foreigner from Australia.

I know people like to say that there were no Ukrainians involved. That is totally debunked. The mere fact that Russia has constantly tried to affect our elections—so has China and so have other countries—does not mutually exclude the fact that there were Ukrainians who tried to affect our 2016 election. Exhibit A to me, Madam Speaker, would be you had the ambassador from Ukraine to the U.S. write an op-ed trying to prevent Donald Trump from being elected President.

That is foreign interference within an election. So, anyway, I don't know where they are getting this stuff, oh, that is Russian propaganda. The only

Russian propaganda that has been the most effective is propaganda from Russia that wants to divide America, and they have done a marvelous job at dividing America instead of bringing us together.

One of the other attorneys who resigned all upset about the treatment of—well, Attorney General Barr wanting them to pull their fangs back in and not try to be so vengeful simply because Roger Stone was a friend of the President. There is no indication the President had hired him to do anything, but they sure went after him because of a connection.

Michael Marando prosecuted the Imran Awan case. He is the guy who let him get away with all of this other activity without proper investigation.

In fact, there was an inspector general here. She ended up being, I think, president of some international technology organization. She was amazing. She had all kinds of evidence to prove felony cases against Imran Awan, but representatives from the U.S. Attorney's Office, I don't know if it was Michael Marando himself, the FBI, working at their behest, ended up threatening her: Don't you bring your notebook with all that evidence.

Then they turned around and later reportedly said: Oh, we interviewed her, she didn't have anything.

Yes, when you ordered her not to bring it to show you the cases against Imran Awan.

□ 1230

But that is Michael Marando. He laid him off with a wrist slap. I don't see how you can find any other basis other than Marando's political motivation. But he didn't pursue any of these other charges, and the question still exists.

As I understand, Imran Awan has filed a lawsuit, and it appears his intention is to try to get back on the gravy train here where he was on Capitol Hill, to get people to sign up to use him. I think there are enough people who got burned that it would probably be hard for him to do.

But a lawsuit, of course, when I heard that he has a lawsuit, that means discovery is in order. I am hopeful discovery will bring out all the lies and the crimes that it appears that he has committed. But no thanks to Michael Marando. He certainly didn't do anything that would have hurt Democrats on Capitol Hill but went out of his way to want to destroy Roger Stone.

Aaron Zelensky started his career as a special assistant to Koh, who was the State Department legal adviser in the Obama administration, but he has also clerked for what I felt was one of the most liberal judges ever, Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens.

He played a key role in obtaining a guilty plea from a guy who was an adviser at one time, Papadopoulos. This poor guy, he didn't have money. When the FBI and the D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office came after him, Mueller's people, he didn't have money to fight.

He was being overwhelmed. They intimidated him enough into his agreeing to plead guilty to a minor charge.

But Zelensky was handpicked by Mueller when he was selecting people who hated Trump. Zelensky was handpicked to be an investigator in that probe. Before joining the Mueller team, Zelensky worked for Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.

Anyway, these people certainly had a lot of political baggage. They were clearly on a vendetta. They weren't pursuing justice. They were pursuing political vendettas, trying to get at President Trump.

There are tens of millions of dollars that were spent investigating what we now know was the Russia hoax. There was no collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia, despite what people are trying to allude to now. It wasn't. The evidence wasn't there. Mueller was disappointed. Weissmann was disappointed. All of these left-wingers were disappointed that, despite all the intimidation, all the threats, they couldn't find somebody who could actually implicate any kind of collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia.

But on Roger Stone's sentencing, when he was convicted, one of the charges was witness tampering. It sure sounds like he was kidding around by saying: Hey, I may have to come over and kill your dog.

I mean, who says that if they are not kidding? That is not all that effective of a threat. But when you have a judge who can't stand the Trump administration, and you have a juror who gets on—I would really like to know what kind of questions the jury was asked during voir dire. If Roger Stone's attorneys did not ask the jury panel their feelings about Donald Trump, then it sure sounds like that would have been malpractice. Roger should have a great case against his own lawyers, plus a great case on appeal for their impropriety as his attorneys.

But I find it hard to believe they wouldn't ask something about that because there is clearly some type of Trump derangement system. Some very smart, well-balanced people get so angry and frustrated over President Donald Trump that they don't think as straight as they normally would.

But to have the foreperson of the jury, the head juror who controls the discussions, shut people down, encourage other people to speak—the head foreperson hates Donald Trump.

Anyway, it is amazing the efforts that the Department of Justice, at least the U.S. Attorney's Office, had gone to, to become a tool for injustice. They wanted to max this guy out, the poor guy. Unbelievable.

I have sent people to prison for life. I have sent people to prison for 10 years, 9 years. I have had to look people in the eye and order them to be taken to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and put to death. Those are serious matters, and you simply cannot let any

type of vengeance or political persuasion affect you.

I know in east Texas, we have assistant U.S. attorneys who vote Democrat. But when it comes to enforcing the law, they enforce the law. They don't care what party you are. And it is so tragic, right here in our Nation's Capital, our own Justice Department, in our own D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office, you have people who are not nearly as just and fair as you find all over the country in most U.S. Attorney's Offices.

Another issue of the local D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office was a guy named James Wolfe. He was indicted by a Federal grand jury on three counts of violating title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1001. At the time he made the alleged false statements to the FBI, James Wolfe was director of security for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and that was a position he had held for about 29 years.

As the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence director of security, James Wolfe was entrusted with access to classified, secret, and top-secret information provided by the executive branch, including the United States intelligence community that they provided to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Wolfe was alleged to have lied to FBI agents in December 2017 about his repeated contacts with three reporters, including through his use of encrypted messaging applications. Wolfe is further alleged to have made false statements to the FBI about providing two reporters with nonpublic information related to the matters occurring before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

He was sentenced to 2 months in prison, 4 months supervised release for lying to the FBI. He has to complete 20 hours of community service—20 hours a month during his release for those 4 months—and pay a \$7,500 fine.

You compare what he did with what Roger Stone did. Roger Stone wasn't dealing with any classified information, secret or top secret. He used some bad judgment. But Jesse Liu's attorneys, these four who have now quit—thank God they quit.

We need to get some people in there where, when it comes to prosecuting, it doesn't matter what the defendant's political persuasion is. You seek justice. And there are Democratic and Republican attorneys, prosecutors, around the country who are quite capable of doing that. So I sure hope that we will get some better attorneys in the D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office.

It is amazing. I thought about Sergeant York, that movie. I believe Gary Cooper played Sergeant York. They were in the trenches, and they couldn't see the bad guys to stop them. He ends up using a turkey call that he used back when he was turkey hunting. One after another, enemy soldiers would stick their head up, and he was able to knock them off and eventually capture

this huge group. But in order to prevail, they had to get them to stick their heads up.

I think that is what this Trump derangement syndrome has done. There are people who have been working pervasively and, apparently, with political vendettas, but they have been able to stay below the radar. Along comes President Trump, and they get so deranged that they expose who they are.

So I thank all those political opportunists and zealots who use their position in the U.S. Government, including the Department of Justice, who have now exposed themselves.

Vindman is one those people who have exposed his animosity, and it is really good that he is no longer part of the National Security Council. It is good his brother is no longer in the Office of General Counsel. I think we will see less leaks now that he is gone from there.

Anyway, we are starting to see those people who have exposed themselves as political operatives, rather than doing justice, or following the orders of their Commander in Chief, we are seeing them exposed. We are seeing them moved out.

I am hoping, in the days ahead, there will be a lot more of that occurring. I think justice will be served better so the American people can feel more like—and not one party or another. People need to be able to feel, as a whole, regardless of the political persuasion of some prosecutor, that justice is being pursued and done, as it is being done in so many Federal districts all over the country. It has been a problem here in Washington, D.C.

When that happens, we will all be better off.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING DR. STEPHEN A. HOLDITCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FLORES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Stephen A. Holditch of College Station, Texas, who passed away unexpectedly on August 9, 2019.

Before I continue our discussion about Steve, I want to give some context about the importance of his professional career.

Let me state, first, that Steve considered his roles as a husband, a father, and a grandfather to be his most important. Because of the exceptional way that he lived those roles, his legacy is readily apparent in the lives of those he left behind—his wife, Ann; his daughters, Katie and Abbie; and their five grandchildren.

The discussion of his professional accomplishments starts with a description of current energy metrics.

Today, the United States of America is blessed to be the number one producer of oil and gas in the world. As of this year, we are a net exporter of oil and natural gas. Reserves of American oil and natural gas rank us among the top 10 countries in the world. We also lead the industrialized world in the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions over the last two decades.

□ 1245

Ten years ago, no one would have ever predicted that we would be where we are today.

This new world of American energy dominance is having dramatic implications, both domestically and internationally. We have secure, stable, environmentally responsible, and attractively-priced energy sources for American families and businesses. We have become a reliable source of energy for our allies, giving them flexibility to move away from unstable Russian and Middle Eastern energy suppliers.

The oil and gas sector of our economy has created millions of good jobs and great paychecks for hardworking Americans. Our balance of trade payments has improved, and our geopolitical position has strengthened.

This dramatic energy renaissance didn't happen by accident or because of government. It is because of the result of American ingenuity, research, and bold leadership. While no one person is solely responsible for this seismic shift in American energy, there are a number of bold leaders who took these challenges that looked impossible to solve and then solved them; particularly in the area of stimulation of low permeability, or "tight" reservoirs. Their developments, studies, research, and field experiments using horizontal drilling and very large hydraulic fracturing treatments revolutionized American oil and natural gas and transformed our economy and our security.

One of those bold leaders was the late George P. Mitchell, Texas A&M Class of 1940. Another is the person that we are honoring today, Dr. Stephen A. Holditch, Texas A&M Class of 1969.

Stephen Holditch was born on October 20, 1946, in Corsicana, Texas, to Damon and Margie Holditch. Growing up, Steve and his family moved often while his father pursued a career in the oil and gas industry. He spent most of his childhood in San Antonio before moving to Richardson, Texas for his final year of high school, where he graduated in 1965.

Following graduation, Steve attended Texas A&M University, where he joined the Corps of Cadets and began his journey as a Fighting Texas Aggie. Steve quickly excelled, both in academics and in the Corps of Cadets. While at A&M, he was a member of Company F-1, a member of the prestigious Ross Volunteers Honor Guard, and a member of the Ross Volunteers Firing Squad. During his senior year, he served as Second Battalion Commander.

In 1969, Steve graduated from A&M with a bachelor of science degree in petroleum engineering. He continued at A&M to earn a master's degree in the same discipline.

Steve began his career with Shell Oil Company in Houston, Texas. Much of his work over his 5 years at Shell was focused on designing and pumping large hydraulic fracture treatments to stimulate production from the deep, low permeability, geopressured gas reservoirs in South Texas.

It was his work with hydraulic fracturing that inspired him to return to Texas A&M and that set him apart from his peers as a true legend in the oil and gas industry for the advancement of this critically important technology.

One day in 1970, Steve was riding the elevator at work and met Ann Friddle, who was also working at Shell. Steve and Ann were married 6 months later, on January 9, 1971, and they had been married for over 48 years when he passed away.

He and Ann returned to College Station, and he pursued a Ph.D. in petroleum engineering, which he completed in 1975. In 1976, Steve joined the Texas A&M petroleum engineering faculty and, as if he didn't have enough to do as a young father and as a new professor, he started his own consulting company, S.A. Holditch & Associates.

S.A. Holditch & Associates quickly became a worldwide powerhouse in the petroleum engineering space. Over the years, Steve earned a reputation for being able to solve the most difficult petroleum engineering problems, especially those dealing with low permeability reservoirs needing stimulation, typically through hydraulic fracturing.

He was distinctly proud of the work Holditch & Associates did alongside the Gas Research Institute to advance understanding of low permeability sandstones, shales, and coalbed methane.

After over 20 years of success, Steve chose to sell Holditch & Associates to Schlumberger, where he stayed on as a fellow, the highest technical designation in that organization. As a Schlumberger fellow for 5 years, Steve traveled extensively to help solve some of the world's most difficult petroleum engineering problems.

In 1995, at age 49, Steve was elected to the National Academy of Engineering, the highest honor that can be given to an engineer. After many years of service to the Society of Petroleum Engineers, or the SPE, Steve was elected to the board of directors, then vice president of finance, and finally president of this global organization with over 70,000 members.

He was awarded almost every recognition that SPE has to give, including three of the society's top awards. He was elected as an SPE honorary member in 2006, the highest award that SPE can bestow upon an individual and was officially named a Legend of Hydraulic Fracturing by SPE in 2014.

While Steve enjoyed many professional successes in the commercial re-

gime, many of his greatest accomplishments were at Texas A&M University, where he served on the faculty for 37 years. During his tenure, he taught 97 courses and served on over 150 graduate committees.

From 2004–2012, Steve worked as head of the Harold Vance Department of Petroleum Engineering. During this time, he revitalized the Crisman Institute for Petroleum Research, and saw the number of students in the petroleum engineering department more than double. Under his leadership, the department quickly earned a reputation as the number one ranked university petroleum engineering department in the world.

It was during his time at Texas A&M that he created his second legacy for America's hydrocarbon industry; the thousands of Aggie petroleum engineers who work around the world every day utilizing Steve's teaching and mentoring to solve the world's greatest energy challenges. Their work, alongside the work of other industry legends, like George P. Mitchell and Michel T. Halbouty, along with Stephen Holditch, have contributed significantly to America's energy dominance that is changing the world today.

In 2013, Steve retired from the faculty after many years of dedicated service to the Texas A&M community. Throughout his life, Steve often credited Texas A&M University as the foundation from which his success grew. He praised the values instilled in all Aggies and, in 2014, was named a Texas A&M Distinguished Alumnus, an honor he richly deserved for a life of service and devotion to his beloved university.

In thanking the Aggie community, Steve said: "You will look back at your years at Texas A&M as one of the best periods in your life. Always remember the Aggie Code of Honor."

In 2016, Steve was inducted into the Corps of Cadets Hall of Honor, an award which made him prouder and happier than perhaps any award he had received in his life.

While in retirement, Steve enjoyed spending time in Bryan-College Station with his wife, Ann, their two daughters, and their five grandchildren. As a season ticket holder to a variety of Texas A&M sports, Steve continued to support the Aggies, but Fighting Texas Aggie football remained closest to his heart.

Steve contributed a great deal to the Texas A&M community, and can be described as a model Texas Aggie, who was true to his core values of excellence, integrity, leadership, loyalty, respect, and selfless service. One of my favorite phrases that Steve often used was: "I reserve the right to get smarter." That is what he did best, always pushing to find solutions to the world's toughest oil and gas challenges.

Madam Speaker, Steve's life was defined by his dedication to his family and his friends, his world-changing accomplishments in energy, and his true

love of Texas A&M University. He will be forever remembered as a true pioneer in his field, a devoted husband, a father, a grandfather, a teacher, a mentor, and a friend.

My father has a saying: "Go make a hand."

Madam Speaker, Steve Holditch truly "made a hand" for his family, his university, his community, our country, and our world.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Holditch family. We also lift up the family and friends of Steve Holditch in our prayers.

I have requested that the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Stephen A. Holditch.

As I close, I would ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from threats abroad, and for our first responders who keep us safe here at home.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PENDING DEBT TSUNAMI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, as I get set up, in past years, when I used to have to sit up there, it was because the Speaker was annoyed with me. I am sure that would never happen in your case. You don't have to say anything.

Madam Speaker, I try to come to the floor every week and sort of talk about what we see actually happening in the economy, what is happening in jobs, and those things. But it is more of a global discussion. And part of that discussion is we see the stories, we know the facts; we are about to be buried in a debt tsunami. And it is not Republicans and Democrats. It is demographics.

There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers; 74 million. We are halfway through turning 65, moving into our earned benefits. And it is such a difficult subject around here because, the fact of the matter is, as soon as you use the word Medicare or Social Security in any type of discussion, even when you are passionately trying to protect those programs, in our modern politics of rage, you just wrote an attack ad saying, well, he talked about Medicare; he must be meaning to do something. That is absurd. If we are not talking about it, we are not going to save them.

Here is the thought experiment. Next 5 years, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, but mostly Medicare, just the growth, equals the entire Defense Department.

Last week, I was here with some boards walking you through, showing

that almost all the 30-year debt, almost every dime of it, is just Social Security and Medicare. It is demographics. And my passion is, I believe there is a way we keep our promises, by using a calculator, by using, actually, economic modeling, using the tools we have around us.

The problem is, in this body, it is complex. Our ability to do simple things the last year has been just incredibly heartbreaking because everything is right now about political gamesmanship, one-upmanship, trying to get the lead, instead of dealing with the reality. It is complex.

So I put up this slide almost every time I come speak, trying to make the point that if you can grow the economy through tax policy, through trade policy, through smart regulations, population stability, getting the immigration system correct, family formation, the adoption of disruptive technology in healthcare—and we are going to talk about that a little bit today—incentives to stay in the labor force.

We are having a miracle right now, mathematically, of the number of our brothers and sisters who are in the labor force and moving into the labor force.

Last Friday, the number of folks who moved from not even looking that entered the labor force was stunning. I know that is geeky, but it is really, really, really important.

I have sat on the Joint Economic Committee now for years, and it was only 3 or 4 years ago we would have these really smart economists come and tell us that labor force participation was going to crash; this type of full employment economy was impossible.

It is here. These types of wage gains, as you know, we just had to recalculate. The productivity numbers turned out to be much higher in 2019 than we thought they were.

How do we take what is working right now, expand those concepts so we hit a level of economic stability and growth that gives us a fighting chance not to be buried in debt? And how does that become partisan rage around here?

I accept my brothers and sisters on the left live in an economic folklore of, well, we will tax rich people, and that will take care of it. And my brothers and sisters with me on the Republican side, we often will get behind microphones and say things like, well, it is waste and fraud. None of those are true.

Let's just, for once, try to tell the truth about the math. The math is stunningly ugly. Simple concepts.

And even last week, I think I brought this board here. If you take the next 30 years, and you pull Social Security and Medicare out, that next 30 years—and I have a 4-year old; I would really like her to have the same type of future I got to experience in my life. But if I strip Social Security and Medicare out of the next 30 years, we have \$23 tril-

lion in the bank. We are \$23 trillion positive. Not inflation adjusted; that is the raw number.

If I pull Social Security and Medicare back into that 30-year window, we are \$103 trillion in debt. And if you want to do constant dollars removed, then drop the number by a third.

□ 1300

You cannot be intellectually credible, honest walking behind these microphones saying you are going to protect Social Security, you are going to protect Medicare, and then not be willing to talk about the actual math. Because I think there is a way that we keep our promises; it just means we have to do everything.

So one of the first things I want to walk through today is a concept, and I am desperately trying to sell and have this sort of become intellectually sort of socialized.

The ACA, ObamaCare, if you really strip it down, what was it? It was a financing bill. Take it down to its most basic. This is hard for a lot of us to accept, but it was who got subsidized and who had to pay.

Our Republican alternative, if you really strip it down, what was it? It was a financing bill. It is who got to pay and who got subsidized.

We almost never have an honest argument around here of what to do to crash the price of healthcare. We have lots of discussions of little incremental changes, and all those incremental changes are important, whether it be HSAs, whether it be disclosures of cost and these things. Wonderful. But they are dishonest when you start to understand the scale—the scale—of what is coming at us.

Back to that 5 years; make it 10 years. Just the growth of Social Security, mostly Medicare, healthcare entitlements, equals the entire discretionary budget. Just the growth portion.

So what do you do to disrupt the cost of healthcare? And my argument is we need to legalize technology.

I am not going to show it today, but in the past, I have come here and shown that we now have the technology; it is in its final stages of hopefully being perfected. It looks like a big kazoo. You blow into it and it instantly tells you you have the flu. It instantly could bang off your medical records on your phone, instantly order your antivirals.

The algorithm we know right now is incredibly accurate, except that technology is illegal in today's conscript. Think of that.

So how do you disrupt healthcare prices? Well, one, I am going to take us to something a little bit different.

Did you know that almost a half a trillion a year—actually, over half a trillion a year, 16 percent of our entire healthcare cost, is just people not following the rules for their pharmaceuticals. They don't take their hypertension medicine. They take too much

of this. They don't take this. That is an adherence problem.

Sixteen percent of our entire healthcare cost is the failure to follow your pharmaceutical protocols. That is not drug pricing; that is not prescription pricing; that is not a PBM; that is not a benefit. That is just you and I, as Americans, we are not following the rules for the pharmaceuticals we have.

Well, it turns out the fastest thing you and I could do to actually have an immediate pop-down on the price of healthcare is actually change pharmaceutical adherence.

Well, it turns out we have technology for that, and here is the thought experiment. We have pill bottle tops that tell you when you open it up or if you didn't open it up, and it will ping you.

So we know right now the adherence of taking your hypertension medicine is one of the most powerful things we can do to actually crash the price of healthcare, but you have got to take it. How many of us forget?

Well, the fact of the matter is, for a few dollars, we could issue that pill bottle with a cap that starts pinging your phone, pinging your family, pinging whoever the hell you want to ping that you didn't follow the rules.

We have actually brought the display here before. It looks like a little dome. It actually distributes pharmaceuticals into a cup.

So, if you are my grandmother, rest her soul, and you have a couple pills you take in the morning, one for digestion at lunch, and a couple before you go to bed, it actually will distribute those at the proper time, in the proper amounts, and then tell you, reminds you, reminds the family if that little cup with the pharmaceuticals hasn't been touched.

It turns out it is a technology solution, and it is a half-a-trillion-a-year issue. Yeah, it is a little hard to explain, but 16 percent of our healthcare cost is just not taking our pharmaceuticals properly.

Is this Republican or Democrat? It is just what we are. And the fact of the matter is a bunch of really creative entrepreneurs, these small, disruptive tech companies, are coming up with a solution.

How do we make that part of what we are trying to move forward? How do you make it reimbursable? How do you actually take Medicare part D and say, instead of the rules right now where someone is supposed to be trying to call, actually, widen up that definition so they could also be providing the technology to make sure someone is taking those pharmaceuticals in the proper fashion?

I am begging this place to open up our minds and think a bit more creatively about what do we do to disrupt the price of healthcare, because, remember, that 30-year debt curve, it is mostly healthcare. And, guess what. Technology is about to help us disrupt it if we could just make that technology legal, reimbursable, part of our plan. We can do some amazing things.

And, actually, in this hyperpartisan environment, this technology hasn't been made Republican or Democrat yet. I am sure we will find a way. What will happen is one of the corporate executives will write someone a check, and we will decide they are all left and right, and we will beat the crap out of each other, but right now, this is an actual solution.

There are other really amazing disruptions coming, and I think this one may have been shown at the consumer electronics show. I am not even sure I understand all the things it does, but this, in many ways, is a doctor visit in your pocket. It does about a dozen different things where it can actually do a number of different tests, and it is in your medicine cabinet.

How do we encourage this type of technology? Because, day after day, we will have individuals coming to us and saying: We have a crisis in the United States. We don't have enough primary care physicians.

They are absolutely right.

So, how do we help those primary care professionals? By saying we can have some technology where it is the type of thing where you can blow into it, you can prick your finger, or it can do this, this, this, this, and it is incredibly accurate. And it is available to you instantly because it is in your own home medicine cabinet.

Let me give you one. What would happen if you could have a major, highly accurate disease detection technology, and it doesn't have to be in your medicine cabinet, but it could be at your local CVS Pharmacy? It turns out this technology looks like it has been perfected.

Your lungs throw off—forgive me, I am going to try to get my technology right. Your lungs actually become part of your body that your blood circulates completely through, I think, every couple minutes. Your breath actually has thrown off proteins and other things that can be detected.

I showed this a couple months ago. Some researchers, I think, are actually working on it, an extension of that flu kazoo that can pick up 20 different types of dead cancer proteins and let you know you have them.

Well, it turns out this technology, actually, now exists today, and the ability of it to actually look for dozens of different types of ailments, a number of different types of cancers. What you do is you just breathe into it for a couple minutes.

Why aren't we running as fast as we can to make this part of our community?

We talk about access to care. The fact of the matter is that supercomputer you hold in your pocket you call your phone, its algorithm, tied in with these types of sensors, whether it be the oxygen sensor I played with last year—I am a severe asthmatic, and we just played with it, and it was helping me dial up and, for the most part, dial down my inhaled steroids. Now, tech-

nically, it was illegal because it is prescribing to me, and it hadn't been approved.

From that flu kazoo I just described to you that is unreimbursable and, ultimately, illegal because the algorithm is writing a prescription to something like this that can do a stunning number of diagnostics if you are just willing to breathe into it for 10 minutes, the miracle is here.

Is this Republican or Democrat? It is neither. It is the future. But, in so many ways, Congress has become the barrier, stopping, holding back the technology disruptions that actually could help us crash the price. And, instead, we seem so much more comfortable having debates about, "Well, who should get subsidized?" "Who should we finance?" "Who should be regulated?" "Who should be controlled?" instead of, "Let's set people free."

We have technology that can help you manage yourself, know what is going on, detect blood cancers through breathing. Why aren't we running as fast as we can to get these things to market to disrupt the price of healthcare?

And, look, it is not a complex premise. We can make the economy grow like crazy. We have seen the expansive effects of the tax reform and some of the regulatory reforms. We have to get the immigration system correct, moving more to a talent-based system. We have to do the incentives for labor force participation. There is a whole bunch of things we need to do, and we just know the economics there.

The hardest part is, as a society, none of that is going to matter unless we have a disruption in the price curve of healthcare delivery. And I am going to argue there is a path, and it is here.

Can I give you sort of a thought experiment? Should Congress have slowed down the internet a decade ago to protect Blockbuster Video?

Think about it. If Blockbuster Video had gone out and hired an army of lobbyists walking around the hallways here, Congress is somewhat in the protection bracket, should we have slowed down the internet to keep that Netflix from putting them out of business?

Of course not. That is absurd, isn't it? Yet Congress does that with all sorts of rules, whether it be reimbursement, the cynicism toward algorithmic health and sensors and these things that can help our medical community, because we will often get certain lobby groups and others who will come in the door and say: This will be really disruptive to our business model. Can you slow it down?

And every day we slow these things down, you are crushing my little girl's future, but you are also crushing the rest of this country because the debt curve is crashing down on us if you actually look at the debt that is going to come out this year.

There was a 4-month report from Treasury yesterday that basically said,

hey, receipts—and I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee—receipts. We don't call them, actually, revenues, but receipts and tax are really healthy.

Last year, we grew over 4 percent, but we spent over 8 percent, and then we will beat up each other, saying: "Well, you wanted to expand this program," or, "You wanted to expand that program."

The fact of the matter is the expansion defense, the expansion of other programs is a fraction of that growth. Almost all that growth in spending is demographics. It is the reality. Those of us who are baby boomers are moving into our earned benefits and we never set aside the money for it, so, if you can keep the promises.

Are you willing to do the combination of things—and you have got to do them all because, it turns out, if you do the labor participation incentives to enter and stay and get involved in the labor force, to do that well, you actually need to be doing things over here in technology that make it available for those who may have certain barriers.

Over here, for certain people with barriers, you have to have regulations that actually work rationally with our brothers and sisters who may have those barriers. It all has to come together.

Can Congress do something that is complex, because it turns out there is no simple solution. There is a complex one, and there is a path.

And the scary part—understand, when we do the math, and this is something I have been doing for a couple years, we still think we hit about 95 percent of debt to GDP. My goal is just to hold us there and not blow through that. It is possible. Can Congress become creative?

So the next one I want to go through, and this is actually sort of fun for me. This is actually one of my older displays. It is from a year or so ago, because I have this fascination with something they call carbon capture.

So a couple years ago, they finally built an electric facility outside Texas, La Porte, Texas, wherever that is. I am sure it is a lovely place. But imagine—and there are two of them. There is a natural gas and a coal-fired power plant, and they don't have smokestacks.

On the natural gas one, they came up with this crazy idea. I think it is called the Allam cycle. You blow up the natural gas, and you actually use the carbon, the burnt, and slam that through the turbines, and then at the other side, you cool it and capture it.

□ 1315

You go, oh, God, we haven't been doing that?

We, last year, in the Ways and Means Committee, perfected, and now we are going to try to do it more, something they call 45Q, which is the incentive to capture and then, over here, to sequester that CO₂. Great.

You get some of those who are cynical saying, well, it can't work, or it is going to be too expensive. We are going to have a little fun with the "too expensive."

The best technology we had last year was a facility, I believe, that is going up in Canada. The Gates Foundation and others are investing in it. Their best number was about \$100 a ton. It is \$100 a ton for substantially pure carbon.

Everybody who geeks out on carbon change and those things, you know you can do lots of things with it. You can, through a chemical process, turn it back into clean-burning fuel. You can do what they do in Texas and other places, which is to pump it in the ground and use it for enhanced oil recovery. But \$100 a ton was sort of our best bet.

I beg of you, if you are someone who is interested in the technology of carbon capture, I want you to go grab your phone and look up the news stories from last October. I want you to put this into your search engine: MIT ambient carbon capture.

Some researchers at MIT last year had just this wonderfully elegant breakthrough. They have a really nice video, if you are not particularly technical, sort of showing how they did nanotubes and electric plates, where they can power them up, power them down, power them up, power them down. They can do this in an ambient environment, so on the roof of your home or on top of a smokestack.

In part of the articles, if I am reading it properly, it wasn't \$100 or \$150 a ton. It is down to \$50 a ton. Their model says it is down to \$50 a ton. You do realize that is almost the market price today?

It turns out, if you are someone who cares about the issue of CO₂ in the environment, we have just had a major breakthrough. And how much discussion does it get? This has been since October. How much joy have you seen in newspapers and articles, talking about a revolutionary breakthrough? And we can be doing mining, because we have to deal with this reality.

The United States has gotten dramatically cleaner in the last 15 years. Good. But a whole bunch of the rest of the world hasn't. Unless we are arrogant enough that we think we are going to turn around carbon-use policies in a bunch of the rest of the world, we are out of our minds.

It turns out we can grow our economy; we can continue to use hydrocarbons; and we have a technology that not only would mine our own CO₂ but would help us on everything else that is being generated in other places in the world.

I am going to digress for just a second. This isn't that same sort of theme. I have come here behind the microphone before and talked about plastic in the ocean.

Before I got this crazy job, I used to love to scuba dive, and we talk all the

time about plastic in the ocean. Here in Washington, D.C., we do lots of virtue signaling. We made paper straws. Of course, how much U.S. and North American plastic actually ends up in the ocean? Substantially none. Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers, 8 in Asia, 2 in Africa.

If you cared about plastic in the ocean, you would go to the 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic—8 in Asia, 2 in Africa—and you would do something. You would create a value for the plastic.

As Republicans, we are trying to do that. But it blows up some of the folklore around here of, well, if we do paper straws in Washington, D.C., we make an effect. Come on.

Look, I understand we live in a world where everything is political, and the virtue signaling makes us feel better. Wouldn't you really prefer to do something that makes a difference?

Back to this concept, a major breakthrough in how you capture carbon, you can do it right out of the air. Now, that is one of the amazing things in this article. It works in ambient air. It doesn't have to be on top of a smokestack.

A couple of days ago, there is an article—one of my personal fascinations, as those of you who claim to pay attention to this know, is the math on methane. As you all know, a couple of years ago, we had to recalculate methane's half-life, so a lot of the old formulas were all wrong. Now, we think methane is about 9 years. But the accepted ratio right now is 1 ton of methane equals 84 tons of carbon.

Okay, so the picture alongside me, because it was the best picture I had, is a flare in remote Texas. They are doing their best to burn off that methane. Someone just came up with the idea: Why don't we just back up a truck, chill it, super-chill it like we do with liquefied gas? We get a valuable commodity, and we capture all of it. And remember the ratio 84-to-1? Well, we incentivize this.

We are already doing the 45Q to create a tax incentive to capture carbon and sequester it or use it in some other things. Wouldn't it make sense to do that same sort of model with methane?

We came behind these mikes a year or 2 ago and showed just the math possibility that a major pipeline to capture methane from oil country, just that single pipeline functioning, it got you just to the Paris accords, slightly below.

The blowback I got was crazy. "Oh, I don't like pipelines." You are saying: "But did you see the math that just this one thing actually had this huge"—"but I don't like pipelines." We need to stop dealing in absurdity.

It turns out, we may be able to do it without the pipeline. Now it is a truck, backing up, chilling it, capturing it. We need to understand things like this. If a portable LNG truck capturing the methane is a solution, is that Republican or Democrat?

Well, in this environment right now, maybe it is Republican, because some of my brothers and sisters on the left hate these technologies. Sorry, that is unfair. A number of them are skeptical of technologies that allow us to keep using hydrocarbons.

My argument is, embrace, love the science, love the technology. It will set you free. Because these things make a difference.

We live in the time of miracles, whether it be healthcare technology or whether it be the single-shot cure for hemophilia. You all saw the article a couple of days ago that we think we might also have a cure for hemophilia, not only A, but B also.

The cures, whether it be for curing people in the chronic population, technology for our environment, or technology to crash the price of healthcare, they are here.

You know, one of the biggest barriers to the disruption that could help us continue to grow the economy, could help us have enough robustness in that economy so we can keep our promises and at the same time get a cleaner environment and healthier economy is this body and its inability to stop the arrogance and thinking that we are so smart, that we think we know what tomorrow's technology is.

When I first got elected, we had a family joke. "When are the two times in life you think you know everything?" "When you are 13 years old and the day after you get elected to Congress." And the family would laugh and then make fun of me.

Now that I have been here a few years, I worry. We have lots of good people, lots of really smart people. And all day long, we are pounded by folks who are trying to protect their business models or their bureaucracy models.

I am begging us, we need to understand the tsunami of debt that is on the horizon, and it turns out, technology is about to provide us solutions that don't bankrupt us and actually provide the solution and don't put government in charge of every aspect of our lives.

This should be a story of incredible hope and excitement. But can we break through the politics of arrogance that we have around here and start being willing to push the envelope of the actual solutions?

Madam Speaker, thank you for tolerating me. I appreciate it. I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 14, 2020, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3803. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Streamlining and Aligning Formaldehyde Emission Control Standards for Certain Wood Products in Manufactured Home Construction With Title VI of the Toxic Substance Control Act [Docket No.: FR 6018-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ42) received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3804. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Advisory — Prudent Management of Agricultural Lending During Economic Cycles received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3805. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (18-1 and 18-4); Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0627 and EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0697; FRL-10003-45] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Stationary Combustion Turbines Residual Risk and Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0688; FRL-10005-14-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT00) received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3807. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Salt Lake County, Utah County, and Ogden City PM10 Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes and State Implementation Plan Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0276; FRL-10004-94-Region 8] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3808. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Wyoming [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0419; FRL-10004-97-Region 8] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3809. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Georgia: Final Approval and Incorporation by Reference of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions [EPA-R04-UST-2019-0310; FRL-10004-27-Region 4] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3810. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Iowa; Linn County; State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0477; FRL-10005-35-Region 7] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3811. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington; Revised Public Notice Provisions and Other Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R10-OAR-2019-0635; FRL-10005-18-Region 10] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Administrative Revisions to Definitions, Remedies, and Enforcement Orders Sections and Incorporation by Reference of National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0483; FRL-10005-16-Region 3] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3813. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; 2019 Amendments to West Virginia's Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0553; FRL-10005-49-Region 3] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3814. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Revisions to NOx SIP Call and CAIR Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0634; FRL-10005-34-Region 5] received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3815. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Transmission Planning Reliability Standard TPL-001-5 [Docket No.: RM19-10-000] received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3816. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specification Task Force Traveler TSTF-541, Revision 2, "Add Exceptions to Surveillance Requirements for Valves and Dampers Locked in Actuated Position" [NUREG-1430; NUREG-1431; NUREG-1432; NUREG-1433; NUREG-1434] received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3817. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler

TSTF-568, Revision 2, "Revise Applicability of BWR/4 TS 3.6.2.5 and TS 3.6.3.2" [NUREG-1433] received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3818. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3819. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Notice of Proposed Permanent Transfer of Major Defense Equipment Transmittal No. R5AT-2019MF004, pursuant to Section 3(d) of the Arms Control Act, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3820. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2019-2021, including the Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3821. A letter from the Director, Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting a notification of sixteen (16) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3822. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's notice — Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 8 of the Clayton Act received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3823. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's notice — Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3824. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Adjustments (RIN: 2900-AQ85) received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3825. A letter from the Associate Administrator for OPA, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Safety of Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities [Docket No. PHMSA-2016-0016; Amdt. Nos.: 191-27; 192-126; 195-103] (RIN: 2137-AF22) received February 12, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3826. A letter from the Board Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2021 Proposed Budget and Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Oversight and Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4990. A bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Science Foundation to carry out research and other activities to promote the security and modernization of voting systems, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-396, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4979. A bill to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support STEM education and workforce development research focused on rural areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4990 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 5884. A bill to establish a grant program to provide legal assistance to eligible tenants at risk of or subject to eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 5885. A bill to make technical corrections relating to parental leave for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Veterans' Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5886. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to develop resources to reduce e-cigarette use by students on campuses of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 5887. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to standardize payment of haz-

ardous duty incentive pay for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 5888. A bill to increase effectiveness in the pursuit of United States interests and multilateral cooperation at the international financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 5889. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to set forth a method of determining maximum out-of-pocket limits and annual updates to premium tax credit eligibility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 5890. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reorganize the Chaplain Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5891. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect funding for certain safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5892. A bill to amend section 9A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that local school wellness policies include a requirement that students receive 50 hours of school nutrition education per school year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5893. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide certain purchasing authority for recipients or subrecipients of grants under chapter 53 of title 49 of such Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. FINKENAUER):

H.R. 5894. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue guidance requiring the list prices of drugs to be included in advertisements for such drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5895. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to eliminate the repatriation loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 5896. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 5897. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make certain information available on a public website relating to intermediate care facili-

ties for individuals with intellectual disabilities certified for participation under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 5898. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify the exception from requirements for the operation of vehicles on certain highways in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 5899. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make debts for student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5900. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 5901. A bill to establish a program to facilitate the adoption of modern technology by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MAST (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5902. A bill to establish a microplastics pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCADAMS (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 5903. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to fixed guideway capital investment grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 5904. A bill to allow a period in which members of the clergy may revoke their exemption from Social Security coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 5905. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a demonstration initiative focused on the development of long-duration energy storage technologies, including a joint program to be established in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5906. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a consumer recycling education and outreach grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 5907. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit administrative offsets of social security benefit payments and social security disability insurance benefit payments with respect to claims arising

from Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 5908. A bill to establish the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. DEAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 5909. A bill to strengthen mental health collaboration in communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COOK, and Mr. GALLEG0):

H. Res. 857. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 858. A resolution condemning Stephen Miller for his trafficking in bigotry, hatred, and divisive political rhetoric and policies that are inconsistent with the trust and confidence placed in him as a Senior Advisor to the President and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that he should immediately resign from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 859. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the "International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife", as designated by the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KING OF NEW YORK:

H.R. 5910. A bill for the relief of Terence George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5911. A bill to provide for the liquidation or reliquidation of certain entries of products of European Union member states exported on or before October 9, 2019, and en-

tered on or after October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 5884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18 of the US Constitution .

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 5887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 5888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 5890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 5891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 5894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 5897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 5898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 5899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 5900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 5901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to make laws that are necessary and proper to carry out its enumerated powers.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 5902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McADAMS:

H.R. 5903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 5905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 5906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 5907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this

legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 1—

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 5909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 33: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 99: Mr. DUNN.
 H.R. 101: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 141: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 336: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 485: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 587: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
 H.R. 763: Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 906: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 1025: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
 H.R. 1041: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1052: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1109: Ms. WILD and Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 1325: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1364: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 1383: Mr. GOODEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1454: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1468: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 1530: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1551: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 1646: Mr. DELGADO.
 H.R. 1680: Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1749: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 1763: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 1766: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr.

STEWART, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1816: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1873: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1897: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 2086: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. SPANO, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2117: Mr. PANETTA.
 H.R. 2178: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 2191: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 2214: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 2219: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. BACON, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2223: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 2339: Mr. GOMEZ.
 H.R. 2344: Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 2350: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 2468: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 2481: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 2491: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 2543: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2581: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
 H.R. 2653: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2782: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 2788: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 2848: Ms. PORTER and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 2891: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 2895: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2986: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2999: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3076: Ms. HAALAND and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3119: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 3228: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 3306: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 3316: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3394: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 3414: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 3510: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3565: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 3570: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 3598: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. PANETTA.
 H.R. 3645: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 3735: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 3822: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3888: Mr. CURTIS.
 H.R. 3929: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 3961: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 3962: Mr. CRIST.
 H.R. 3964: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3967: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4078: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 4109: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 4117: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 4189: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 4215: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 4220: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 4221: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 4280: Ms. SHERRILL.
 H.R. 4301: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4386: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 4429: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 4644: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 4764: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4820: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4848: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 4898: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 4900: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 4995: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 5041: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 5051: Mr. WALTZ.
 H.R. 5166: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 5169: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 5172: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CURTIS, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 5191: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 5229: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5243: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 5249: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5254: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 5312: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 5376: Mr. BARR and Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 5416: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 5434: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
 H.R. 5494: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 5517: Ms. WEXTON and Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 5534: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 5549: Mr. OLSON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 5552: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5567: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 5581: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 5592: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 5595: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 5602: Mr. TRONE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. DEAN.
 H.R. 5626: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 5702: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 5707: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 5708: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 5764: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 5771: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 5775: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 5793: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 5811: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 5831: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SPANO.
 H.R. 5845: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5862: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 5863: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 5866: Ms. DEAN.
 H.R. 5874: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 408: Ms. WEXTON.
 H. Res. 579: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 745: Ms. CRAIG.
 H. Res. 825: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 827: Mr. PERRY.
 H. Res. 828: Ms. WILD.
 H. Res. 851: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,
 84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to requesting that Congress enact legislation to repeal from existing Federal law any statutory impediments to the Federal government—and State governments—availing themselves of their purchasing power to leverage and negotiate lower prices from pharmaceutical manufacturers for prescription drugs taken by recipients of the Medicare or Medicaid programs; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.